FOREIGN
BROADCAST
INFORMATION
SERVICE

Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-89-019
Tuesday
31 January 1989

Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-89-019 CONTENTS *31 January 1989*

PRINTING ERROR IN 30 JANUARY SOVIET UNION DAILY REPORT: Pages 14 and 15 of the 30 January Soviet Union DAILY REPORT were printed incorrectly, corrupting the item entitled "Present, Future East-West Relations Examined," which began on page 11. We are reprinting this item in its entirety in today's book, in the "Worldwide Issues" section.

NOTICE TO READERS: An * indicates material not disseminated in electronic form.

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

Reaction to Warsaw Pact Statement on Forces Cited 1
- 'Approximate Parity' Claimed *[Solton on Moscow International]* 1
- Said To Reflect 'Openness' *[Levin on Moscow Radio]* 1
- NATO Figures 'One-Sided' *[Moscow TV]* 2
- Figures Not 'Official' *[Chernyshev on TASS]* 2

CSSR Arms, Budget Reductions Announced *[TASS]* 3
General Lizichev on Troop Cuts, Restructuring *[Prague RUDE PRAVO 27 Jan]* 3
Karpov Cited on Soviet Disarmament Initiatives *[Karpov in Sofia OTECHESTVEN FRONT 27 Jan]* 4
Aboymov 'Hails and Supports' Military Cuts *[TASS]* 5
FRG Welcomes Pact's Unilateral Arms Cuts *[TASS]* 5
Upcoming NATO-Warsaw Pact Talks Viewed *[Levin on Moscow Radio]* 6
Arms Reduction Forum in Geneva Concludes *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 27 Jan]* 6
Inspectors in U.S. for Missile Destruction *[TASS]* 7
Planned Increase of U.S. Bases in UK Criticized *[Osipova on Moscow Radio]* 7
NATO Nuclear Weapon Update Plans Denounced *[TRUD 27 Jan]* 7

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

Gerasimov Gives 31 January News Conference 9
- Combat Escalates in Afghanistan *[TASS]* 9
- Lukyanov To Attend Hirohito Funeral *[TASS]* 9
- Gratitude for Aid Offers *[TASS]* 9

Reportage on Cuban Missile Crisis Symposium 9
- Conference Termed 'Fruitful' *[TASS]* 9
- Cuba's Risquet Speaks *[Moscow International]* 10

Results of CSCE Talks in Vienna Assessed 11
- Shevardnadze Cited *[Moscow Radio]* 11
- 'Outstanding Success' *[PRAVDA 31 Jan]* 11

Upcoming China Visit by Pakistan's Bhutto Noted *[Klenov on Moscow International]* 12
Economic Ties with Asia, Pacific Discussed *[Moscow Radio Peace and Progress]* 12
'Technical Error' Cuts Nakasone Remark on TV Show *[Moscow International]* 13
Present, Future East-West Relations Examined
[Zorin, Nakasone, Kissinger, Falin, Primakov on Moscow TV] 13

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

U.S. Must Meet Sino-Soviet Summit With 'Maturity' *[TASS]* 22
Tower Ignores Arms Cuts, Pushes Military Build-up *[Moscow Radio]* 22
Soviet Television Interviews Jesse Jackson *[TASS]* 23

China

Media Preview Shevardadze's Upcoming Visit to PRC 23

- TASS Interviews Shevardnadze 23
- Wu Xueqian Comments *[TASS]* 24
- PRC Press Comments Cited *[TASS]* 25
- IZVESTIYA Previews Visit *[TASS]* 25
- 'Peaceful Coexistence' Sought *[Moscow TV]* 25
- Agenda for Talks Noted *[Moscow International]* 26

Continuation of U.S. Policy on Taiwan Questioned *[Moscow International]* 26
Sino-Vietnamese Talks Focus on Cambodian Issue *[Radio Peace and Progress]* 26

Northeast Asia

Japanese Military Budget Increase 'Perplexing' *[TASS]* 27
Japanese Hints of 'Diplomacy Through Force' Noted *[Andrianov on Moscow Radio]* 28
ROK Group Asked To Build Moscow Trade Center *[Seoul THE KOREA TIMES 29 Jan]* 28

Near East & South Asia

Shevardnadze, Afghan Ambassador Discuss Relations *[TASS]* 29
Afghan Opposition 'Rejects Compromise' *[IZVESTIYA 31 Jan]* 29
Maslyukov Arrives After Yazov for Talks in Kabul 30
- Such Conferences 'Only Natural' *[Moscow International]* 30
- Another Meeting With Najibullah *[PRAVDA 31 Jan]* 31

New Delhi Conference Views Afghan Situation *[TASS]* 31
Baker Clarifies Policies on South Asia Relations *[Ivanov on Moscow International]* 32
Pakistan's Bhutto First Official Visit to PRC *[Moscow TV]* 33
Foreign Affairs Official on Mideast Policy *[London AL-HAWADITH 27 Jan]* 33
DPLP's Secretary Hawatimah Holds Moscow Talks 35
- No Soviet-Israeli Ties *[Kuwait KUNA]* 35
- Arabic Paper Interviews Hawatimah *[Abu Dhabi AL-ITTIHAD 29 Jan]* 36

East Europe

Further on Zaykov, Delegation Visit to Belgrade 36
- 25-Member Delegation Arrives *[Belgrade Radio]* 36
- Zaykov Conveys Gorbachev Greetings *[Belgrade TANJUG]* 36
- Zaykov Addresses Belgrade Communists *[PRAVDA 28 Jan]* 37
- Trade Imbalance Discussed *[Belgrade TANJUG]* 40
- Zaykov Ends Visit, Departs *[Belgrade TANJUG]* 40
- Results of Zaykov Talks Reviewed *[PRAVDA 30 Jan]* 41

Gerasimov, Urban Hold Joint Moscow News Briefing *[Warsaw TRYBUNA LUDU 25 Jan]* 41
PZPR-CPSU Relations Never 'as Good' as Now *[PRAVDA 29 Jan]* 43
Hungarian Troop, Armaments Reductions Reported *[TASS]* 43

West Europe

Gorbachev To Make State Visit to FRG 12-15 June *[Hamburg DPA]* 44
Gorbachev's Planned UK Visit To Take Place in April *[TASS]* 44
Soviet-UK Symposium Discusses European Security *[TASS]* 44
UK Cooperation on Alleged Nazis Welcomed *[PRAVDA 29 Jan]* 44
Bessmertnykh Receives Turkish Ambassador 30 Jan *[TASS]* 45

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Political & Social

PRAVDA Previews Next Stage of Election Process *[26 Jan]* 46
- Outline of Sakharov Program *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 27 Jan]* 46
- Scientists, Other Candidates Listed *[IZVESTIYA 28 Jan]* 47

Music Store Workers Announce Strike, Make Demands *[SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA 31 Jan]* 47
NKAO Committee Completes First Week *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 28 Jan]* 48

Aganbegyan Defends Baykal-Amur Railroad *[Moscow TV]* ... 49
Armenian Appointments, Dismissals Reported *[Yerevan Radio]* ... 50
Armenia Quake Commission on Restoration Problems *[PRAVDA 29 Jan]* ... 51
Tajik Quake Relief Work Continues Despite Snow *[SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA 28 Jna]* ... 51
  Relief 'Mistakes,' Current Needs *[Moscow Radio]* ... 52
  Pope Cables Gorbachev *[TASS]* ... 53
Estonian Independence Party Criticized *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 29 Jan]* ... 53
Banned Latvian Church Magazine Returns to Print *[Vatican City International]* ... 55
Lithuania's Brzauskas on Draft Constitution *[Vilnius International]* ... 55
Formation of Baltic National Armies Viewed *[SOVETSKAYA LITVA 13 Jan]* ... 55
Lt Gen Kuzmin Identified as Baltic Commander *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 25 Jan]* ... 56
Ukraine Official on 'National Culture' Policy *[PRAVDA UKRAINY 20 Jan]* ... 56
Turkmen Party Plenum on Elections, Restructuring *[IZVESTIYA 27 Jan]* ... 60
  Central Committee Secretary Elected *[Moscow TV]* ... 61
Reporter in Minsk Gets Apology for False Charge *[TRUD 25 Jan]* ... 61
Church Services Resume in Belorussia *[TASS]* ... 62
Kuropaty Commission Chairman Interviewed *[IZVESTIYA 26 Jan]* ... 63
Moldavian Prosecutors on Ethnic Problems *[SOVETSKAYA MOLDAVIYA 20 Jan]* ... 63
Bar on Entry to Norilsk 'By No Means Necessary' *[SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA 24 Jan]* ... 64
Kazakhstan Names New Housing Minister *[Alma-Ata Radio]* ... 65
Journalist Considers Treatment of Former Leaders *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 25 jan]* ... 65
Procurator General Answers Phone-in Questions *[Moscow Radio]* ... 66
Academician Kudryavtsev Discusses Human Rights *[IZVESTIYA 26 Jan]* ... 67
Moscow MVD Official on Handling of Rallies *[SELSKAYA ZHIZN 29 Jan]* ... 70
Official Zaslavskaya on Public Opinion Center *[Moscow TV]* ... 70
*Education Council Chairman on Congress Results *[ARGUMENTY I FAKTY No 3]* ... 72
  *Committee Official on Outcome *[PRAVDA 24 Jan]* ... 73
*Two Hijacking Attempts Foiled, Punishment Urged *[IZVESTIYA 27 Jan]* ... 75
Correction to Implications of Churbanov Verdict ... 75

Economic

Legal Inconsistency Seen Threatening Co-ops *[ARGUMENTY I FAKTY No 4]* ... 75
*Economist on Deficit, First Year of Reform *[LITERATURNAYA GAZETA 25 Jan]* ... 76
Vice Premier Batalin Views Construction Reform *[London MORNING STAR 30 Jan]* ... 81
Maritime Kray Leader Views Enterprise Zones *[IZVESTIYA 25 Jan]* ... 82
Sakhalin's Nogliki Oil, Gas Industry Develops *[Moscow TV]* ... 84

Agricultural

Ligachev Troubleshoots at Dairy Combine 27 Jan *[Moscow Radio]* ... 85
Ligachev Visits Meat Processing Plant 26 Jan *[PRAVDA 27 Jan]* ... 85

Military

Northern Waters Naval Buildup Denied *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 28 Jan]* ... 86
Yazov Sees No Improvements in Army Training *[PRAVDA 22 Jan]* ... 86
Air Force Training Customs Squander Resources *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 24 Jan]* ... 87
General Meshcheryakov's Obituary Published *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 26 Jan]* ... 88

Reaction to Warsaw Pact Statement on Forces Cited

'Approximate Parity' Claimed

LD3001171289 Moscow World Service in English 1210 GMT 30 Jan 89

[Yuriy Solton commentary]

[Text] The Defense Ministers Council of the Warsaw Treaty Organization has made a statement on the alignment of arms and armed forces in Europe. Yuriy Solton writes the following in comment.

The Warsaw Treaty and NATO can be said to maintain an approximate parity of forces in Europe with neither side having a decisive advantage. The Warsaw Treaty is estimated to have more than 3,573,000 troops stationed in Europe and the seas washing it, while NATO is estimated to have over 3,660,000 troops. However, the level of this obvious parity seems to be too high. In the near future the two alliances will start talks on reducing their troops. According to the Warsaw Treaty military leaders, the future reductions must strip both sides of their surprise attack capability or, for that matter, of any offensive capability. At the same time, the sides must be able to maintain secure defenses.

Asymmetries and imbalances in armaments are another important issue which has caused much speculation in the West. True, the Warsaw Treaty has nearly a double advantage in tanks, but NATO leads in the number of strike aircraft and anti-tank rocket complexes, and its naval forces are 2 times stronger than those of the Warsaw Treaty. These and other asymmetries do not break the approximate parity, but they must be taken into account. The simple solution suggested by the Warsaw Treaty is to reveal all imbalances both in Europe at large and in individual regions and to remove them by reducing the overall military level. This is to be followed by radical arms and troops reductions, based on the equal security principle.

The Warsaw Treaty member-states have proved their readiness to make lower military confrontation in Europe a reality by announcing unilateral reductions of arms, troops, and military budgets. The Soviet Union alone will put out of service 500,000 troops, 800 combat aircraft, and 10,000 tanks over the next 2 years. In doing so, it will withdraw six tank divisions from the German Democratic Republic, Czechoslovakia, and Hungary. This move is not to be linked on the future talks. The alignment of forces data presented by the Warsaw Treaty Defense Ministers Council are not intended to underlie the talks or to be substituted for their subject. Still, they can help the participants to hold the talks in a realistic key from the very start by preventing them from seeking advantage.

Said To Reflect 'Openness'

LD3001205389 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 30 Jan 89

[Text] [Announcer] The foreign media are devoting a great deal of attention to the statement by the Warsaw Pact defense ministers concerning the correlation of numbers of armed forces and weapons between the Warsaw Pact Organization and NATO in Europe and adjoining seas. With me at the microphone is our foreign policy commentator, Viktor Levin. I will ask him to give an appraisal of the statement.

[Levin] This document, amply supplied with tables containing many figures, presents a full picture of the numbers of armed forces and quantities of the main types of weaponry of the Warsaw Pact countries in Europe, and it gives figures comparing them with the NATO countries. If these figures are approached comprehensively—and only such an approach can be considered objective—it emerges that the military balance in Europe is typified by an approximate parity which gives neither the one side nor the other the possibility of counting on a decisive military advantage.

[Announcer] Of course, all this is serious food for thought, but as far as I can judge, there is in general no great revelation in these conclusions. The Warsaw Pact states have repeatedly said previously that this is just how things stand, that is, that there is an approximate parity.

[Levin] Yes, but you must agree, it is one thing to assert, and another to prove it. I will not for the moment go into why we did not provide the figures before. What is important is that in the process of restructuring foreign policy, the process of giving real substance to the theses of the new political thinking, the Warsaw Pact countries are not holding back with repayment of their debts. The talks on reduction of armed forces and conventional weapons in Europe are to begin in March, but the baseline factual material has been presented to the NATO bloc at the end of January. We have repeatedly stressed that openness is an indispensable element of the new political thinking, and the allied socialist countries are displaying this openness in deed.

[Announcer] How about this detail: It draws your attention that all the figures cited in the statement are presented as of 1 July 1988. After this, the socialist countries made decisions on unilateral reductions of their armed forces and their military budgets over 2 years. These measures will begin to be implemented in the very near future, so that amendments will evidently have to be made in the initial period of the upcoming talks.

[Levin] Yes, amendments will have to be made very soon. As early as the first half of this year a Soviet tank divison stationed near the town of Veszprem and a tank training regiment will depart from the territory of Hungary. The withdrawal of troops will continue in the second half of the year. Two tank divisions, two separate tank training regiments, and eight separate battalions are being withdrawn from the GDR's territory this year.

I would like to stress that the unilateral reductions have been assessed on their merits in the West. FRG Foreign Minister Genscher reckons that these actions constitute not only an important step from the military viewpoint but also an encouraging political signal, while U.S. General Galvin, commander in chief NATO armed forces in Europe, has given an optimistic evaluation of the prospects for reductions in conventional weapons in connection with the new initiatives of the socialist countries in this sphere. True, NATO's obstinate desire to take the path of modernization of tactical nuclear missiles and other types of weapons, in my view, not only fails to increase optimism but also puts one on one's guard.

But one thing is clear: The energetic actions of the socialist countries, in particular the publication of official figures about the numbers of armed forces and quantities of main types of weaponry of the Warsaw Pact countries in Europe, remove many obstacles to the success of the forthcoming talks.

NATO Figures 'One-Sided'

LD3001231789 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 30 Jan 89

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] A statement by the Warsaw Treaty Defense Ministers Committee on the correlation of the numerical strength of the armed forces and arms of the Warsaw Pact and NATO organizations in Europe and adjoining seas was published today.

[Begin recording] [Correspondent Vsevolod Solovyev, identified by caption] Colonel General Bronislav Aleksandrovich Omelichev is the first deputy chief of the General Staff of the USSR Armed Forces. Bronislav Aleksandrovich, data has been published about the correlation between the numerical strength of the armed forces and arms of the Warsaw Pact and NATO. Why is it that our side had not published this data earlier?

[Omelichev] As long ago as March of last year, the Warsaw Pact member states proposed that data on the armed forces and conventional arms of the allied Warsaw Pact and NATO countries in Europe should be officially exchanged between these two military and political alliances. The question of this exchange was also raised by Army General Dmitriy Timofeyevich Yazov, USSR Minister of Defense, during his conversation with U.S. Defense Secretary Frank Carlucci in Bern last March. NATO, however, shunned an exchange of this kind and subsequently, for propaganda purposes, it did publish its own version of the data concerning the correlation of the armed forces and arms between the allied armed NATO bloc and Warsaw Treaty.

Our appraisal of the one-sided nature of these publications is known. Taking into account the importance of the present point in time, in connection with the Vienna meeting which is nearing completion, and in order to refrain from creating additional difficulties in the course of the Vienna meeting and to refrain from distracting the attention of the participants in the talks, it was decided to publish the statement of the committee of defense ministers following the completion of the Vienna meeting. This, then, was done today both by our central papers and in the mass information media of the Warsaw Pact countries.

[Solovyev] Recently, Warsaw Pact member states have, one after another, consistently announced significant and unilateral reductions of their armed forces. Have these actions been coordinated or not?

[Omelichev] The general line on this score was worked out at the conference of the Political Consultative Committee in Warsaw. This question was also examined by the Defense Ministers Committee in December last year. As for specific reduction figures and the publication of this data, these are independent decisions of each state.

[Solovyev] Bronislav Aleksandrovich, can one now observe within NATO some sort of activity aimed at giving replies that are commensurate with the Soviet initiatives and the initiatives of other Warsaw pact countries—I have here the unilateral disarmament initiatives in mind.

[Omelichev] Our reductions are being carried out unilaterally. They are not tied to negotiations, nor are they bound by any other conditions. And even though we are not putting forward demands that NATO countries should undertake specific steps of one kind or another in reply, we nevertheless hope that analogous measures will be taken on NATO's part.

Unfortunately we have so far had no information that NATO countries have somehow reacted to our unilateral steps. On the contrary, some military commanders of the NATO countries are against NATO also commencing unilateral reductions. [end recording]

Figures Not 'Official'

LD3101070589 Moscow TASS in English 0651 GMT 31 Jan 89

[Text] Moscow January 30 TASS—By TASS military writer Vladimir Chernyshev:

The Warsaw Treaty Defense Ministers' Committee has published the numbers of the organisation's troops and principal weapons as well as its assessment of NATO armed forces in Europe and adjoining seas.

Why did it make the data public? Wouldn't it have been more productive before talks on conventional armaments in Europe to swap only those numbers with NATO that are needed for the talks?

This correspondent put these questions to Major-General Yuriy Lebedev, first deputy chief of a department of the Soviet Armed Forces' General Staff.

"The Warsaw Treaty countries proposed this kind of exchange way back in March 1988. It would definitely have helped to effectively identify imbalances and asymmetries in the armed forces and armaments of the sides.

"But the NATO countries preferred to unilaterally publish their own data and assessments distorting the correlation of the military potentials in Europe as their figures were selective, covering just the ground forces and partially also the air forces," the Soviet military expert said.

"This made it imperative to show in a more real and broader context the correlation of the armed forces of the two military-political alliances in Europe.

"Hence the statement of the Defense Ministers' Committee of the Warsaw Treaty countries, which gives the complete picture of all the components of the armed forces—the ground forces, air forces, air defence forces and navies.

"An analysis of this data compellingly attests to such a military balance in Europe as can be described, considering all its ingredients, as a rough parity giving a possibility to neither side to count on a decisive military advantage," General Lebedev said.

"The publication of data regarding the Warsaw Treaty's armed forces and armaments is at the same time another long strike to greater openness in the military field, which by itself is an essential factor for stronger trust between East and West.

"Besides, the published numbers make it possible to better grasp and appreciate unilateral steps by the USSR and other Warsaw Treaty members to reduce their armed forces and armaments.

"Although the data made public by the Warsaw Treaty Defense Ministers' Committee cannot be seen as official material for the talks, it offers nonetheless a possibility to form a more objective view of the problem of asymmetries and imbalances to be addressed at the future negotiations.

"An analysis of this data will make it possible to get not only a comprehensive view of the sides' armed forces but also a better idea of their ultimate levels that should be sought by both sides," General Lebedev said.

CSSR Arms, Budget Reductions Announced

LD2701213589 Moscow TASS in English 1909 GMT 27 Jan 89

[Text] Prague January 27 TASS—On January 27 the Czechoslovak Council of Defence announced here a decision on cutting the Czechoslovak People's Army and armaments as well as on organisational changes in the Army. The decision was taken in line with the defensive military doctrine of the Waraw Treaty member states. It provides for carrying out appropriate measures in 1989-1990.

A statement circulated on this occasion points out that Czechoslovakia starts, thereby, consistent realisation of its initiative on establishing a zone of confidence, cooperation and goodneighbourly relations along the line of contact between the Warsaw Treaty and NATO states and joins the Soviet proposals set out in Gorbachev's speech at the U.N. General Assembly session.

It is planned to cut defence spending by 15 per cent in 1989-1990. The numerical strength of the Army will be reduced by 12,000. As many as 850 tanks, 165 infantry armoured carriers and 51 warplanes will be discarded and gradually liquidated. Weapons and materiel of three combined-arms divisions will be storaged [as received]. Only personnel necessary for guarding property and maintaining order will remain at these divisions.

A decision was taken to cut the number of divisional and regimental exercises by 50 per cent, the number of military shootings—by 25-30 per cent and numerical strength of reservists called up for training—by 15,000.

The above unilateral measures are taken, proceeding from the principle of defence suficiency and ensurance of the country's reliable protection. They are Czechoslovakia's specific contribution to confidence-building measures in Europe. In case the NATO states show a desire to carry out similar measures in their armed forces, Czechoslovakia is ready to continue this process, points out the statement.

General Lizichev on Troop Cuts, Restructuring

AU3001153689 Prague RUDE PRAVO in Czech 27 Jan 89 p 7

[CTK report: "Defensive Nature of the Military Doctrine; General Lizichev on Soviet Proposals To Cut Armed Forces and Weaponry"]

[Text] Prague (CTK)—Army General Aleksey Lizichev, chief of the Main Political Directorate of the Soviet Army and Navy, who is currently paying a visit to the CSSR, granted an interview to the correspondents of CTK and OBRANA LIDU.

Asked about the progress of restructuring in the Soviet Armed Forces, he replied that, naturally, restructuring in the Soviet Armed Forces is connected with restructuring in Soviet society in its entirety and in the CPSU. This cannot be otherwise since the Armed Forces are an integral part of society and will develop and live according to the laws of this society. The development of the Armed Forces must be oriented toward qualitative parameters, be it in relation to combat technology and the development of the martial arts or in relation to the composition of the Armed Forces. It is necessary to guarantee continued reliable security for our country and its allies. At the same time, restructuring relies on the defensive nature of the military doctrine.

Restructuring in the Army is irreversible, he said. We have created a new moral situation in the military collectives. Criticism and self-criticism have proliferated, but of course, we uphold the principle that he who criticizes must also propose solutions and work.

I think that I can also add to the list of successes the fact that combat readiness has been raised and its quality improved. Certain progress has been achieved in the quality of training. As far as discipline is concerned, in the last 3 years there has been a decline in the number of transgressions and criminal offenses in the Armed Forces. This is true of all types of troops, all military districts, and all levels. Our task is to reinforce this tendency.

Asked about the response in the Soviet Army to the measures and initiatives aimed at cutting troop numbers and weaponry, he said:

The speech and the proposals made by Mikhail Gorbachev in the UN on 7 December 1988, aimed at ensuring security and peace, have been welcomed by us. Mikhail Gorbachev announced troop cuts of 500,000 men. The number of tanks will be reduced by 10,000, the number of artillery systems by 8,500, and the number of aircraft by 800. We have maintained, and continue to maintain, a clear position, which ensues from new political thinking and from the principles of reasonable defense sufficiency. Our cuts are an example for all other states, above all for NATO states.

We have demonstrated a realistic approach to the reduction of armed forces and weaponry, with regard to both strategic offensive systems and conventional systems. However, so far we have not registered steps in the needed direction and efforts at balance of interests and forces on the part of the Western partners. The socialist countries are surrounded by military bases, on which 500,000 well-armed U.S. soldiers are deployed. We have 2 aircraft carriers with 38 planes deployed on each, while the United States has 15 aircraft carriers with 98 planes on each. One-half of them are capable of carrying nuclear weapons. Is it possible to speak of parity here? Or take the offensive air force; in Europe alone, the United States has a preponderance of 1,400 aircraft and it also has more helicopters. When we speak about balance of forces, they want balance only in ground forces, in which they are weaker than we. We possess a higher number of tanks and artillery systems, but they possess more antitank weapons. They refuse to take the Navy and Air Force into consideration. Once comparisons are made, they should extend to everything. It is necessary to include the strategic nuclear forces, ground troops, the Air Force, the Navy, and so forth. And only if there is mutual balance is it possible to conduct talks. Regrettably, voices continue to be heard demanding that a policy-from-the-position-of-strength be practiced vis-a-vis the Soviet Union and its allies. Both the former and the current U.S. Presidents and other representatives of the U.S. Administration have spoken to this effect. We cannot weaken our combat readiness in this situation. We must strengthen our alliance and combat cooperation because unilateral disarmament can lead to only one thing—the loss of political independence.

As to the principle of reasonable sufficiency, the general said that this is a principle of building the Armed Forces that results from the defensive doctrine. At present, the Soviet Armed Forces are being rebuilt on this principle in such a way that the Army and Navy are minimal in terms of their size, while being in conformity with the evolving military and political situation in the world and safeguarding the reliable defense of the USSR and its friends against attack. This principle relates to the forces of general designation—the ground troops, the Air Force, Air Defense, the Navy. The Soviet strategic nuclear forces must, in their entire triad—that is, ground strategic missile forces, submarines armed with ballistic nuclear missiles, and strategic bombers—be built on the principle of balance with the U.S. strategic forces. One to one, as they say. This is the principle we shall observe until the question of the complete elimination of strategic nuclear forces is definitely solved. The aggressor must know that should he dare launch an attack he will get the appropriate reply. Therein lies the essence of reasonable sufficiency, General Lizichev stressed.

Karpov Cited on Soviet Disarmament Initiatives

AU3001131489 Sofia OTECHESTVEN FRONT in Bulgarian 27 Jan 89 p 3

[Article by Viktor Karpov, USSR deputy minister of foreign affairs: "Basis of Security"—especially written for OTECHESTVEN FRONT]

[Text] The new Soviet initiatives in the area of disarmament that Mikhail Gorbachev announced in New York, including the unilateral steps related to reducing armed forces and armaments in Europe and Asia, created an essentially new political context for continuing the process of detente. The upcoming withdrawal of six tank divisions and offensive weapons from Eastern Europe and the reduction of armed forces by 500,000 troops testifies to the fact that a restructuring of the USSR Armed Forces on the basis of a defensive military doctrine has begun.

Now plans and timetables have been prepared, which along with disbanding the relevant units (including those that will withdraw from Eastern Europe and Mongolia), envisage, on the one hand, reducing the number of persons who are called up for active military service, and on the other, increasing the number of soldiers who are transferred to the reserve forces. The order and timetable of reorganizing the divisions that will remain on the territory of the allied European countries, are also being determined. These divisions will acquire a new defensive structure. All measures related to these reductions will be implemented in conditions of maximum glasnost and openness [otkritost], and foreign observers will be invited.

We consider it purposeful to utilize elements of the weapons that are destroyed in the national economy. For example, the engines of the tanks can be used for peaceful goals in other kinds of heavy equipment, while parts of the launching means for the "SS-20" missiles can be used for heavy-load cranes, something that was done in Odessa together with a FRG company. In fact, the destruction of USSR missiles in accordance with the INF Treaty caused a saving of R300 million in 1988.

The issue of the balance of power in the various categories of armaments and armed forces will be the subject of a thorough discussion. In order to assess the scope and importance of the announced reduction of the Soviet Armed Forces by 500,000 soldiers, one must remember that this number approximately equals the entire FRG Bundeswehr. In fact, the reduction of 10,000 tanks, 8,500 artillery systems, and 800 combat aircraft aims at eliminating the West's concerns. The qualitative and quantitative dimensions of this reduction are unprecedented: The goal is to give the Soviet Armed Forces a purely defensive character.

The main shortcoming of the NATO declaration lies in the fact that it does not take into consideration those asymmetries in armaments that are in NATO's favor. Consequently, the document in question does not aim at eliminating the asymmetries of the two countries on a mutual basis, and hence it cannot serve as a position in future talks. It is my opinion that people in NATO should think about their position, which must encompass all elements of the subject matter of the talks, and could produce mutually acceptable decisions. The USSR and the United States already have a solid basis in everything related to the treaty on reducing offensive strategic weapons by 50 percent. The drafts of the treaty itself, and the accompanying protocol and memorandum on the initial data, have been worked out. Therefore, I think that such a treaty could be signed in 1989. A parallel advance along the road of reducing the USSR and U.S. offensive strategic weapons by 50 percent, as well as reducing conventional weapons, would create a new basis for guaranteeing security in Europe and throughout the world.

Aboymov 'Hails and Supports' Military Cuts

LD2801200189 Moscow TASS in English 1946 GMT 28 Jan 89

[Text] Moscow January 28 TASS—The Soviet Union "hails and supports" several major moves to cut armed forces and armaments as well as military expenditures, which were taken unilaterally by its Warsaw Treaty allies in the recent past, Ivan Aboymov, USSR deputy foreign minister, told a TASS diplomatic correspondent.

He noted that the other day the German Democratic Republic declared cuts in the strength of the National People's Army, some types of weapons and military expenditures to be carried out in the next two years. Bulgaria, Hungary, Poland and Czechoslovakia announced plans to slash their military budgets. Bulgaria, Poland and Czechoslovakia also reported decisions to cut considerably their armed forces. Earlier, Romania had reduced the strength of its armed forces, armaments and military expenditures.

"These steps are consonant with the Soviet decision to cut substantially its armed forces, about which Mikhail Gorbachev said at the United Nations on December 7, 1988," noted Ivan Aboymov. "In agreement with its allies, the Soviet Union also decided to withdraw part of its troops and armaments from the GDR, Czechoslovakia and Hungary."

According to the Soviet deputy foreign minister, the steps taken by the Warsaw Treaty member states "are prompted by their common desire to bring down the level of military confrontation in Europe, to implement real disarmament and to strengthen European and international security."

"These measures," he said, "are being implemented in line with restructuring the system of military potentials of allied states on the basis of defensive sufficiency, without detriment to their obligations on ensuring reliable security of the socialist country."

The measures proclaimed by the Warsaw Treaty states contribute to removing suspicion and hatred and create, thereby, a favourable atmosphere for coming talks on reduction in conventional weapons as well as on confidence-building measures and security in Europe, noted Ivan Aboymov. "On the whole, this is an impressive contribution to consolidating and developing positive trends in international affairs and to asserting a qualitatively other state of affairs in Europe and in the world."

FRG Welcomes Pact's Unilateral Arms Cuts

LD2801205289 Moscow TASS in English 2007 GMT 28 Jan 89

[Text] Bonn January 28 TASS—The West German Government welcomes unilateral steps to cut numerical strength of their armed forces, which were taken by the USSR, the GDR, Bulgaria and Poland. It expresses the hope that the Warsaw Treaty countries will not stop halfway and will consistently translate into life their decisions, West German Government Spokesman Friedhelm Ost said here on January 28.

The declaration of specific periods and comparative numerical indicators on troops and weapons to be withdrawn and on reduction in military budgets will contribute to strengthening further confidence measures, Ost went on to say. The FRG's aim in the sphere of arms control and disarmament is to strengthen security in Europe by achieving equal upper ceilings of armaments at the lowest possible level. The West German Government backs disarmament talks in all spheres: between the USSR and the USA on cutting strategic offensive weapons, 500-kilometre-range nuclear missiles as well as conventional weapons and troops. The Federal Republic links the implementation of specific steps on disarmament with the results of coming talks on armed forces and conventional weapons.

Upcoming NATO-Warsaw Pact Talks Viewed

LD2801204589 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 28 Jan 89

[Viktor Levin commentary from the "Latest News" program]

[Text] Here is the latest international news commentary. It is devoted to the upcoming negotiations between NATO and the Warsaw Pact on reducing armed forces and armaments on the European Continent. In particular, a correspondent for one of the U.S. agencies reports, or emphasizes, that an exchange of detailed information will be of vital importance for these negotiations. The agency quotes a statement from an unnamed high-ranking NATO figure who said that the representatives of the North Atlantic bloc are going to insist specifically on an exchange of information concerning disarmament plans. At the same time, he emphasized the impotance of verification. Let us hear how international commentator Viktor Levin evaluates this report.

[Levin] The fact that intensive preparations for negotiations are taking place at NATO Headquarters and in all of the states that make up the organization—and that is how I interpret the ASSOCIATED PRESS cable—is completely natural. A discussion of very important, and let us be frank, delicate questions lies ahead and obviously a serious and extensive preparation is required. At the same time, however, I get the impression that the correspondent's interlocutor just cannot break free from the snares of outdated ideas. Long gone are the times when the Soviet Union and other socialist countries had to be persuaded of the importance of verification. The clearly excessive secretiveness that enabled the NATOists to manipulate arbitrarily numbers they had compiled concerning the quantitative and qualitative composition of the Warsaw Pact armed forces and armaments is receding into the past. During a recent meeting with representatives of the Trilateral Commission, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev said that we intend to publish soon data on our defensive potential in Europe and the Far East. We need not worry that this publication will be long in coming.

We also should say that on the eve of negotiations the socialist countries also are taking concrete actions that emphasize the defensive nature of their military doctrine. Unilateral cuts in armed forces and armaments already have been announced in five socialist countries. The timetable for withdrawal of Soviet military units and subunits from the territory of Hungary and the GDR is worth noting, as well. It seems appropriate to me to quote statements made about this by the U.S. newspaper THE NEW YORK TIMES. With reference to U.S. Government experts, the paper notes that the new details about Moscow's plan for withdrawing some of its forces from Eastern Europe provide grounds for thinking that this withdrawal will significantly limit Moscow's ability to begin a sudden invasion of Western Europe. I would say the terminology is of a somewhat dubious nature, but the essence has been noted correctly; we do not intend to attack and this is confirmed by the measures we are taking. According to Western experts, THE NEW YORK TIMES continues, the new details indicate that the planned withdrawal will be an important one from a military point of view. This is how the socialist countries are acting, even before the negotiations between NATO and the Warsaw Pact have begun.

As far as NATO is concerned, I turn again to the ASSOCIATED PRESS cable. It cites statements by a high-ranking NATO employee to the effect that now is not the time for discussion about the modernization of tactical nuclear weapons since, the employee declared, there is not the least doubt that we need the modernization. To my mind, one just cannot call that kind of approach a constructive one. In comparison with the other statements we quoted previously, this declaration shows that militarist dogmas still are very stong within NATO and the negotiations obviously will be complicated.

Arms Reduction Forum in Geneva Concludes

PM3001132189 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 27 Jan 89 First Edition p 3

[TASS report: "Conference Concludes"]

[Text] Geneva, 26 Jan—The conference on the problems and prospects of reducing armed forces and conventional arms in Europe, organized by the UN Institute for the Study of Disarmament Problems, has completed its work in the Geneva Palais des Nations.

As Serge Syur [name as published], assistant director of the UN Institute for the Study of Disarmament Problems, and Manfred Mueller (GDR), a member of the institute's administrative council, emphasized in a summation of the results of the 3-day debate in camera, that the discussion of the cardinal issues of reducing the level of military confrontation in Europe proceeded in a businesslike, constructive spirit. It clearly demonstrated the desire of all the participants in the all-European process to negotiate and seek points of contact, however complicated the issues awaiting resolution. This quest, S. Syur noted in particular, is the purpose of staging such conferences.

The conference organizers noted the unquestionably positive impact on the course and nature of the discussion produced by the Soviet Union's announcement of unilateral reductions in its armed forces, which is seen as an important step in the direction of eliminating the present imbalances and asymmetries in the arms sphere. A high appraisal was also given of the constructive attitude taken by the Soviet representatives at the conference to the problems of European security and reducing armed forces and conventional arms on the European Continent.

Addressing a press conference in the Palais des Nations at the end of the conference, V.P. Karpov, USSR deputy foreign minister, and Colonel General N.F. Chervov, chief of an administrative group in the USSR Armed Forces General Staff, stressed that the success of the talks on conventional armed forces in Europe beginning in Vienna in March depends on the extent to which the participants are able to overcome the inertia of routine and on whether they can demonstrate a truly innovative approach to these very complex issues. A fresh view of things, unburdened by the weight of the past, and new, innovative proposals and solutions are needed now as never before.

Inspectors in U.S. for Missile Destruction

LD3101090189 Moscow TASS in English 0847 GMT 31 Jan 89

[Text] New York January 31 TASS—Fourteen Soviet military inspectors arrived at the U.S. Davis Monthan Air Force Base in Arizona on Monday to monitor the third round of the elimination of U.S. cruise missiles under the INF Treaty.

They are to watch the destruction of 43 cruise missiles and 12 missile transporter-erectors. American workers destroy the weapon systems by cutting them with hand-held saws and plasma arc torches.

In all, the INF Treaty envisages the elimination of 443 land-based cruise missiles and 403 Army Pershing missiles within the first three years.

Planned Increase of U.S. Bases in UK Criticized

LD2901221289 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 GMT 29 Jan 89

[Text] The U.S. Air Base at Molesworth in Great Britain is to be closed tomorrow. The British Ministry of Defense has said that it is no longer needed following the Soviet-U.S. accord on intermediate- and shorter-range missiles. Here is our commentary. Valentina Osipova is at the microphone.

[Osipova] There are two U.S. military bases on British territory where U.S. cruise missiles have been kept: Greenham Common and Molesworth. After the Soviet-U.S. accord on intermediate- and shorter-range missiles came into force, the withdrawal and subsequent elimination of the missiles began. There are no more cruise missiles at Molesworth, and tomorrow an official ceremony is to take place where it will be announced that activity of the unit of U.S. missile troops situated there is to cease. As to Greenham Common, the withdrawal of missiles from there is to be completed by 1991, after which, according to the British Ministry of Defense, that base will be closed down too. Yes indeed, there will be no U.S. cruise missiles on British territory.

But does it mean that the number of U.S. military sites will be cut? The answer seems to be in the negative. At the same time that the British Ministry of Defense announced the date for closing down the Molesworth base, a Pentagon report appeared across the Atlantic concerning the Pentagon's intention to double the funding for its military bases and installations in the British Isles over the next 2 years, and moreover, to open new ones there. According to THE INDEPENDENT, Greenham Common in particular will be used as an air base; underground storage for nuclear equipment is planned for construction at certain other bases; and the Bentwaters base has been chosen for the basing of the new Strike Eagle fighters, which one should stress play a key role in the program of modernizing NATO's nuclear arms.

These reports show that London and Washington continue to regard Great Britain as NATO's right-flank country. While, following positive changes in the international climate, Spain and Greece are demanding the removal of U.S. military installations from their territories and the FRG has introduced limitations on military exercises, the British Conservatives still stick to the role of the most devoted U.S. ally and support its militarist strivings. The belligerent mood of certain of the country's political and military circles is still very strong. While hailing the positive tendencies seen in the development of the international situation in words, in deed they remain advocates of the continuing arms race.

However, all sensible British oppose that. They demand that the government act in accordance with the Soviet Union's peaceful initiatives. To all appearances, the rise of optimism seen among the British antiwar campaigners who have struggled for the elimination of the Molesworth cruise base has been dampened by the news of the plans for stepping up Great Britain's role in NATO's militarist projects.

NATO Nuclear Weapon Update Plans Denounced

PM3001094189 Moscow TRUD in Russian 27 Jan 89 p 3

[Own correspondent V. Boykov dispatch under the rubric "At the Crossroads of Opinions": "'New Challenge to NATO'"]

[Text] Brussels, January 27—Brussels has reacted very ambiguously to the USSR decision announced in Vienna on the unilateral withdrawal of some tactical nuclear systems from central Europe. As the capital of Belgium, it has not only welcomed the new Soviet initiative but also raised once again the question of a reciprocal step by NATO. What people here mean by this, above all, is a reconsideration of the plans to modernize the North Atlantic alliance's tactical nuclear arsenals.

The Soviet Union's decision to reduce its European tactical nuclear weapon potential was examined by the Politburo of the Flemish Socialist Party, which belongs to the government coalition. This step, its members declared, "has strengthened the confidence of Socialists that the debate on modernizing nuclear arms is entirely premature."

L. Tindemans, Belgium's Christian Democrat minister of foreign relations, made the following comment on the USSR's new initiative: "The measures announced by the Kremlin with a view to reducing arms will hinder the process of modernizing NATO's nuclear arms."

But how has Brussels responded to this "challenge" as the Atlantic capital? An official spokesman for the NATO Headquarters declared that the North Atlantic alliance is "pleased with the unilateral reduction in the Soviet tactical nuclear forces." While calling this a "reassuring" step which "creates a favorable atmosphere for the upcoming disarmament talks," at the same time he did not refrain from the traditional allegations about "overwhelming Soviet superiority."

The leadership of the North Atlantic alliance regards as seditious the suggestions that it respond with deeds to the unilateral Soviet reductions in the sphere of conventional and nuclear arms. At the same time it is actively promoting the Washington and London policy of modernizing nuclear arsenals.

During a recent conversation with NATO Secretary General M. Woerner I inquired how he accounts for the "need" for such a step.

"The Soviet Union," the NATO secretary general replied, "has superiority in short-range nuclear forces. In addition, why do you want us to stop the modernization, which has not yet begun, while you continue carrying out your own? You cannot be serious. You do not ask our permission, but we should ask yours. We have a minimum of weapons in this category, and we must improve them if we need to."

I asked B. Adam, who heads the Brussels group for research and information on problems of peace, to comment on these arguments.

"Disputes over who has more weapons, and how many, led the Vienna talks on the mutual reduction of armed forces and armaments in central Europe into a total impasse," he said. "So should we push the problem of tactical nuclear arsenals into the same position? If the Soviet Union has more of these weapons, it will have to give up more. But for this it is necessary to begin corresponding talks. Moscow is ready for them. The West, unfortunately, is not yet ready.

"As for the charges that the USSR, by modernizing its tactical potential, is trying to torpedo analogous Atlantic efforts, E. Shevardnadze gave, in my view, a clear reply to them. The Soviet Union, he declared in Vienna recently, is not modernizing tactical nuclear missiles. Thus, there is no need for the North Atlantic alliance to build up and improve nuclear arsenals. And now the question of reducing and eliminating such potentials in Europe is becoming increasingly urgent. The USSR's formulation of this problem is a new peaceful challenge to NATO."

Gerasimov Gives 31 January News Conference

Combat Escalates in Afghanistan

LD3101145189 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1406 GMT 31 Jan 89

[Text] Moscow, 31 Jan (TASS)—The combat operations that Soviet troops are conducting in Afghanistan are aimed at ensuring their withdrawal to the Soviet Union's territory according to the approved schedule. The combat operations of our groups do not envisage other tasks or goals, Colonel General Bronislav Omelichev, first deputy head of the USSR Armed Forces General Staff, said answering questions from journalists at a news conference here today.

The escalation of combat operations, Gennadiy Gerasimov, head of the Information Directorate of the USSR Foreign Ministry, added, occurred because of the attempts by the armed opposition to cut off large towns, primarily Kabul. In the area of southern Salang, Nangarhar Province, Afghan armed forces carried out operations including massive aviation and artillery strikes. The rebels suffered tangible losses in men and equipment. Many arsenals were eliminated.

During the storming of a number of fortified rebel areas in Salang, the representative of the USSR Foreign Ministry continued, it turned out that some of their firing positions were protected with sacks containing flour, rice, and sugar. He stressed that this is taking place while the capital is facing the threat of hunger, and the situation is being saved only by the air bridge along which food is being delivered to Kabul from USSR border regions. The rebels seize tanker trucks carrying fuel and burn them senselessly while huge lines form for fuel in Kabul.

Lukyanov To Attend Hirohito Funeral

LD3001134789 Moscow TASS in English 1337 GMT 30 Jan 89

[Text] Moscow January 30 TASS—The funeral of the late Japanese Emperor Hirohito will be attended by a Soviet delegation led by Alternate Politburo Member Anatoliy Lukyanov, who is a first vice-president of the Presidium of the Soviet Parliament.

This was announced at a news conference here on Monday by Soviet Foreign Ministry Spokesman Gennadiy Gerasimov who was answering a question from a correspondent of the Japanese newspaper ASAHI.

Gratitude for Aid Offers

LD3001154889 Moscow TASS in English 1406 GMT 30 Jan 89

[Text] Moscow January 30 TASS—Since the recent Tajikistan earthquake was limited in its scale and effects, the number of people requiring medical aid is luckily not too high and there is no need to send specialists and equipment to the stricken area from abroad, according to a Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman.

Spokesman Gennadiy Gerasimov, chief of the ministry's Information Directorate, told a briefing here on Monday that many countries and organizations had offered to help with rescue efforts and medical services to quake victims.

The countries willing to help include France, Italy, the United States, West Germany and many others.

The Foreign Ministry spokesman expressed gratitude to all those offering their aid.

Reportage on Cuban Missile Crisis Symposium

Conference Termed 'Fruitful'

LD2901162989 Moscow TASS in English 1604 GMT 29 Jan 89

[Text] Moscow January 29 TASS—A tripartite symposium on the 1962 Caribbean crisis has been fruitful, said Georgy Shakhnazarov, aide of the general secretary of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee, speaking at a press conference here today. The symposium was attended by prominent politicians, public figures and scientists of the USSR, Cuba and the United States.

Mikhail Gorbachev's and George Bush's addresses to the participants in the symposium emphasized its significance. It is very important, said Georgy Shakhnazarov, that for the first time in 26 years after the Caribbean crisis Soviet, American and Cuban representatives met to give a joint appraisal of the events of that time. He noted "a really friendly round-table atmosphere". The three delegations sincerely wanted to find the truth. "We made a further headway in comprehending the Caribbean crisis," said Shakhnazarov. "It is most essential that while there were different opinions on many questions there was a coincidence of views on lessons of the crisis, i.e. what should be done to avoid crisis situations, how international politics should be conducted nowadays."

Speaking at the press conference, former U.S. Defense Secretary Robert McNamara has said that one of the lessons of the 1962 events is that efforts should be exerted to prevent crises. East-West political tension should therefore be lessened through removing mutual misunderstanding and mistrust. If we dare to break stereotypes of the four preceding decades, we shall be able to help mould such a type of international relations which will lead to establishing a peaceful and prosperous world community, said Robert McNamara. He highly assessed the Soviet Union's foreign policy course, based on new political thinking.

Full elimination of nuclear weapons is the best guarantee for avoiding Caribbean-like crises, said member of the Politburo and Secretariat of the Cuban Communist Party's Central Committee Jorge Risquet Valdes. We welcome the Soviet-American INF Treaty, since for the first time in history it provides for destruction of arsenals of existing weapons. Jorge Risquet Valdes expressed satisfaction with the fact that the joint statement on the results of the symposium's work stressed that big and small states and peoples have the indisputable right to independence, sovereignty, free choice of the way of socio-economic development.

Cuba's Risquet Speaks

PA3001203189 Moscow in Spanish to Cuba 0200 GMT 30 Jan 89

[29 January speech by Jorge Risquet, member of the Politburo and Secretariat of the Communist Party of Cuba, and head of the Cuban delegation at the symposium on the 1962 Caribbean crisis held in Moscow with the participation of delegations from the United States, Cuba, and the Soviet Union—recorded]

[Text] The Cuban delegation is pleased to have been able to express, on the basis of equality and with complete freedom, Cuba's point of view on that crisis.

We have met not only to write the history of the crisis and to fill in gaps by exchanging information each of us has on the subject, but also to learn for the sake of the present and the future.

The lessons we may have learned in promoting peace for the benefit of mankind now and in the future are the best reward for this exchange of information.

We think the complete elimination of nuclear weapons is the best way to guarantee that the world will never again be placed at the brink of nuclear war.

In this regard, as we all know, an agreement was reached on the elimination of intermediate- and shorter-range ballistic missiles. This is an important step, not because of its direct significance, for I understand this agreement covers only 4 percent of the nuclear arsenal, but because this is the first time an agreement has been reached that does not reduce or place limits on the production of nuclear weapons, but actually destroys existing nuclear weapons.

Soviet President Gorbachev has specifically proposed the elimination of 50 percent of all strategic missiles in a first phase that would be followed by a second phase during which the remaining 50 percent would be destroyed to contribute to ridding mankind of nuclear and chemical weapons, as well as all other weapons of mass extermination, in this century.

The first conclusion we may reach is that it is necessary to maintain the political will to secure the total destruction of nuclear and chemical weapons and of all other weapons of mass extermination.

This is a task that will take time to complete. Thus, preventive measures such as nuclear test limits or prohibitions, denuclearized regions, and control systems, are good ideas because human or computer errors could provoke a nuclear war.

Small countries are always exposed to aggression from powerful countries. For centuries, when nuclear weapons did not exist, militarily weak countries were subjected to colonialism by militarily powerful countries.

This means that small countries will always face this danger. This is why it is important to strengthen international relations based on strict respect for the rights of all nations to be fully independent and sovereign and to freely choose, with no foreign meddling, the social system the people may want.

If we look at the October crisis, we will find that the United States, not wanting a socialist revolution in Cuba, was the factor that created the conditions that led to the tragic days of October 1962.

Yesterday, I recalled that our people carried out our revolution against the bloody Batista dictatorship without any Soviet bullets or rifles. All the weapons we used for our revolution had been seized from the enemy. They were U.S. weapons because the Batista army used U.S. arms.

On 17 May 1959, 4 months after the revolutionary victory, we promulgated an agrarian reform nationalizing large landholdings, whether national or foreign, and distributing the land among the peasants who lived on those lands without owning them. That happened on 17 May. On 18 May, President Eisenhower authorized the preparations for a punitive expedition against Cuba. This expedition came in the form of the Bay of Pigs aggression on 17 April 1961.

The Kennedy administration had inherited the plans for this adventure from the Eisenhower administration, and it did not have the wisdom to scratch them. It went on with the plans, and this is how the Bay of Pigs came about.

After the Bay of Pigs, our country was absolutely certain that the United States, which maintained its goal of destroying the Cuban revolution, had no other way to achieve its goal than to launch a direct aggression. A mercenary brigade would be unable to resolve the problem, not enough mercenaries could be found to engage in an adventure of that nature, and our country was getting militarily stronger as time went by.

This is why we called on the Soviet Union to see how we could guarantee resistance to a U.S. aggression we saw coming. The Soviet Union then proposed to us the installation of nuclear missiles in Cuba. Our party leadership accepted the proposal. The crisis continued to unfold.

The origin of the crisis was that the United States claimed for itself the right to decide whether or not a country could or could not have a certain social regime. If the United States had understood then that Cuba is a sovereign nation that can choose whatever social regime the people may want, there would have been no differences, no Bay of Pigs invasion, and no October crisis.

A second conclusion we may reach is that the powerful countries should abandon the philosophy that they can impose their policies or social regimes on small countries.

We have recently seen how the United States has mined the ports of a nation that in terms of population is smaller than Cuba: Nicaragua. The counterrevolutionaries inside Nicaragua openly receive arms and aid that comes from the U.S. budget.

This means the United States has not abandoned its philosophy. Therefore, a new crisis could emerge unless there is a change of attitude.

Results of CSCE Talks in Vienna Assessed

Shevardnadze Cited

LD2601145989 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1330 GMT 26 Jan 89

[NOVOYE VREMYA review for 27 January]

[Text] NOVOYE VREMYA special correspondent Galina Sidirova comments on the progress of the Vienna meeting. The delegates for the 35 member states of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, writes the author, left Vienna having achieved the impossible, it appears. USSR Foreign Minister Eduard Amvrosiyevich Shevardnadze, during the work of the Vienna meeting, gave an interview to the journal NOVOYE VREMYA.

Responding to questions from the correspondent, he appraised the results of the work thus: I would say that it is a gigantic success. Of course, the process was not unambiguous. Talks were frequently tense, and even dramatic. All the same, Europe has hitherto not known such a democratic dialogue. The interaction of states has risen to a qualitatively new level, making it possible to adopt the meeting's concluding document and to reach the Vienna agreement.

'Outstanding Success'

PM3101111789 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 31 Jan 89 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report on 30 January news conference at USSR Foreign Ministry press center: "The Result of New Thinking"]

[Text] The results of the Vienna all-European meeting represent an outstanding success for the new realistic approaches to international affairs and are, in their content and positive consequences, an unprecedented event not just for Europe but for the world as a whole. Reactions currently coming in from many countries concur with this assessment of the Vienna meeting made by M.S. Gorbachev in his replies to the PRAVDA editorial office.

The Helsinki process has been raised to a qualitatively new level in several spheres, Yu.V. Kashlev, head of the USSR delegation at the Vienna meeting, stated. Talks among the 35 states on confidence-building and security measures in Europe, and among the 23 states that are members of the Warsaw Pact and NATO—on the reduction of conventional armed forces and armaments from the Atlantic to the Urals—are to be held for the first time within the CSCE framework. The Vienna conference was marked by a real "breakthrough" in the human rights sphere, where the concept of the human dimension of the Helsinki process was established for the first time and a mechanism for cooperation among states was created, including the holding of all-European conferences on this issue in Paris, Copenhagen, and Moscow.

The wide-ranging program adopted in Vienna for talks, conferences, and other forums in the military-political, economic, ecological, humanitarian, and other spheres will be a specific contribution to building the "common European home." Eleven such events are planned for 1989-1991.

It was noted at the news conference that the policy of restructuring and democratization in the USSR, the new image of our country which is taking shape, and its foreign policy initiatives, expressed in concentrated form in M.S. Gorbachev's UN speech last December, had decisively influenced the results of the Vienna conference.

Yu.S. Deryabin, head of the USSR Foreign Ministry Department on Security and Cooperation in Europe, who addressed the news conference, briefed journalists on starts already made by the Soviet Union in implementing the Vienna accords in all spheres. While seeking to ensure that the commitments adopted in the final document of the Vienna meeting are strictly observed by all participant states, he noted, the USSR itself will, of course, abide by them without exception, making sure that there is no discrepancy between words and actions.

In accordance with the USSR's political commitments ensuing from the Vienna accords, additions and amendments will be introduced to Soviet legislation and legally enforceable acts.

K.F. Mikhaylov, first deputy chief of the USSR Foreign Ministry Administration for Arms Reduction and Disarmament, drew attention to the importance of the information on the correlation of Warsaw Pact and NATO force strengths and armaments in Europe and adjoining waters published by the Warsaw Pact countries.

Replying to a question from a British journalist, he emphasized that the question of the reduction and elimination of tactical nuclear weapons can under no circumstances be put off for long. These talks could be held in parallel, independently, and should include all components of the tactical nuclear systems, including the nuclear component of dual-purpose systems.

A question was asked about the Soviet side's specific steps with respect to implementation of the Vienna accords in the human rights sphere. Yu.S. Deryabin stated that within 6 months all outstanding applications concerning contacts between people will be examined. It is planned to publish all laws and legally enforceable acts relating to freedom of movement within 12 months.

A Danish journalist inquired about the opinion of those addressing the news conference with respect to the U.S. delegation's provisos in Vienna concerning the conditions for holding a conference on humanitarian problems in Moscow. Common sense gained the upper hand, Yu.B. Kashlev said in reply to this question. The U.S. side agreed to a conference in Moscow, incidentally linking its possible participation in the conference with progress in the human rights sphere in the Soviet Union. I have no reason to doubt that the process of democratization in our country will continue, he stressed. It is an inner need. The head of the Soviet delegation said further that Moscow would ensure the openness of the upcoming forum's events.

Upcoming China Visit by Pakistan's Bhutto Noted

OW2901011389 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 0300 GMT 24 Jan 89

[Commentary by station commentator Klenov]

[Text] According to the official spokesman in Islamabad, the Pakistani Prime Minister Benazir Bhutto will pay an official visit to China from 11 to 14 February. The following is a short article on this matter by our station commentator Klenov.

The new Pakistani prime minister's plan to visit China this year was announced not long after she took office in December last year. According to the new prime minister, the development of all-around ties with China is the top priority of Pakistan's foreign policy. This visit to Beijing is the first overseas trip for the new prime minister. Although Benazir Bhutto visited Saudi Arabia earlier this month, that was an unofficial visit.

It must be pointed out that ever since the establishment of diplomatic relations in 1951, China and Pakistan have maintained a close and chummy relationship. When the father of the new prime minister, Ali Bhutto, was prime minister, the situation was the same. It was also similar during the rule of the military dictator Ziaul Haq, who was killed in an accident last year. Because of his death, Ziaul Haq was unable to visit China for a fourth time. After assuming power in 1977, Ziaul Haq visited China on his first overseas trip. In recent years, China and Pakistan have strived to expand political, economic, scientific, technical, cultural, and military cooperation. Trade between the two countries has expanded rapidly. China has helped develop and construct important projects for Pakistan. In addition to other bilateral agreements, the two countries have signed a cooperation agreement on the peaceful use of nuclear energy. Government and military delegations of the two countries frequently exchange visits. During talks in recent years, the two countries have also discussed the Afghan issue, as well as bilateral issues. This is understandable because China and Pakistan are both neighbors of Afghanistan.

I think when Benazir Bhutto visits China, this issue will be an important part of their talks. Islamabad and Beijing have outstanding political clout, and can use their prestige to help resolve various regional issues in Asia, including mediation of the Afghan issue.

Economic Ties with Asia, Pacific Discussed

OW2801021689 Moscow Radio Peace and Progress in Mandarin to Asia-Pacific Region 1300 GMT 23 Jan 89

[Station commentary]

[Excerpts] Recently in our commentaries, we have talked about economic and trade relations between the Soviet Union and the Asian-Pacific countries. The significance of this matter has prompted us to take a further look at it. Today, we shall discuss economic relations between the Soviet Far East and its partners in the Asian-Pacific region. The following is a station reporter's commentary.

We all know that the Soviet Union has begun to implement a long-term, comprehensive program for the development of the productive forces in the Far Eastern region by the end of this century. Its fundamental goal is to develop a highly efficient comprehensive economic system working with other countries through division of labor in the Far East by the end of this century. [passage omitted]

The Soviet Far East has accumulated experience in economic cooperation with foreign countries, primarily the PRC. Border areas of the Soviet Union and China have worked closely together and expanded the scale of cooperation. Last year, Heilongjiang Province and the Soviet side signed about 160 technical and economic agreements and contracts, 15 of which are being implemented.

The process of economic integration of Asian-Pacific countries has prompted the Soviet Union to change the nature of its economic relations with foreign countries. We are especially interested in the establishment of joint ventures, and have looked for new approaches to cooperate with foreign partners. In this connection, certain progress has been made in nongovernmental talks with South Korea. [passage omitted]

The Soviet Government is also very concerned about the development of intergovernmental friendship and cooperation with Asian-Pacific countries. Japan could play a great role in the development of the economy in the Soviet Far East. During his visit to Tokyo in December last year, Soviet Foreign Minister Shevardnadze offered specific suggestions for the Soviet Union and Japan to vigorously promote economic, trade, scientific, and technilogical relations. However, this suggestion did not receive the desired official response from Japan. As a result, Japanese business circles, which possess tremendous potential for the development of the Soviet Far East, are unable to play a greater role in developing the economy of that region. [passage omitted]

We hope that, in the new year, the concrete plans and suggestions for promoting mutually beneficial economic cooperation between the Soviet Union and the Asian-Pacific nations is realized.

'Technical Error' Cuts Nakasone Remark on TV Show

LD3001161689 Moscow World Service in English 1500 GMT 30 Jan 89

[Text] In their comments on a Soviet television program, Western news agencies alleged that the ex-prime minister of Japan, Nakasone's, remarks about the affiliation of northern territories was deliberately omitted. As the host of yesterday's program, the Ninth Studio, Valentin Zorin admitted today a purely technical error had been committed. A top category translator didn't hear and thus failed to translate one remark by Mr Nakasone, who spoke rather quickly.

Mr Nakasone said, for one thing, that among the unresolved problems between the USSR and Japan there was the affiliation of northern territories, or four Kurile islands. Valentin Zorin reported that the entire discussion had been televised without any cuts. He regretted the error and promised to apologise for it in one of the next programs.

Present, Future East-West Relations Examined

OW2801074289 Moscow Television Service in Russian 0455 GMT 28 Jan 89

["Studio 9" program presented by Prof Valentin Sergeyevich Zorin, political observer for Soviet television and radio; with former Japanese Prime Minister Yasuhiro Nakasone; former U.S. Secretary of State Henry Kissinger; Valentin Mikhaylovich Falin, chief of the CPSU Central Committee International Department; and Yevgeniy Maksimovich Primakov, director of the World Economics and International Relations Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences; Kissinger speaks in English and Nakasone in Japanese, fading into Russian translation]

[Text] [Zorin] Hello, comrades. Today, the discussion group present at our "Studio 9" table at Ostankino Television Center is somewhat unusual. Members of the rather influential, in the Western world, Trilateral Commission, are visiting Moscow and we decided not to miss an opportunity such as this.

First of all, I would like to introduce to you the participants in today's talk: Mr Yasuhiro Nakasone, prime minister of Japan from 1982 to 1987, and Dr Henry Kissinger who was the national security adviser and U.S. secretary of state in the Nixon and Ford administrations from 1969 to 1977. Also participating in our talk is Valentin Mikhaylovich Falin, doctor of historical sciences, chief of a CPSU Central Committee department and a prominent Soviet scholar; and one of the leading Soviet scholars in the field of social sciences, Yevgeniy Maksimovich Primakov, director of the World Economics and International Relations Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences.

Before we begin our discussion today I would like to give you a short outline of the Trilateral Commission. Certain people in the West fond of sensationalism have, on occasion, called this body the invisible government of the Western countries. Certainly this is somewhat more than an exaggeration, but also certainly, this organization is very influential. It was created more than 15 years ago, in 1973, at the initiative of David Rockefeller, the American banker, with prominent U.S., West European, and Japanese government, academic, and public figures taking part in this organization. This commission, as a rule, convenes behind closed doors; meets once a year in various countries; publishes reports; conducts research; and exerts considerable influence on the thinking and policies of the leading capitalist countries. Traditionally, people who occupy official government positions are not members of the commission. Many prominent figures have made it known that they are members of the commission. In particular, it has become known that Jimmy Carter has been a member, although by and large members of his government have not been members of this commission. Presently, the commission has some 300 members. In April last year this commission met in Tokyo, and its most recent meeting was held in Moscow. During the course of the Moscow talks the question of

West-East relations was discussed. As you know, members of the Trilateral Commission held a substantial and detailed talk with Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, during which a large number of pressing and important problems were discussed.

Well, after this preamble I think that we can now begin our discussion. I assume that the participants in our discussion today would assess the many problems that exist in the world today in different ways. But I feel that in dealing with one question, in all likelihood, there ought to be no serious disagreements. A different world, quite unlike the one that existed previously, is emerging before us today. Many old perceptions and political stereotypes no longer apply and now new paths into the future should be explored. In connection with this, I would like to ask every participant in our talk today to briefly respond to the following question: Slightly more than a decade remains before the end of this century. What, in your opinion, will be the dominating factor in this period? I have in mind the problems pertaining to economic and political areas. I will ask Dr Kissinger to be the first to respond to this question.

[Kissinger] The predominant feature in both economics and politics will be the growing interdependence of the world. It is becoming increasingly clearer in politics that the traditional ways and means that states solved their problems—for example, by means of war—is no longer possible.

Should this path be chosen once again it would be catastrophic for all—for those who win and those who lose. It follows that all conflicts must be resolved by means of diplomacy, by means of recognizing vital mutual interests, including security interests, which is the goal of all states.

In the sphere of economics the world is also becoming interdependent. Not a single country can, in isolation, successfully solve its problems. This has long been recognized in the non-socialist world. I was amazed to hear, during talks with your Soviet leaders, that they too now agree that the economies of socialist and non-socialist countries have to be linked in some sort of system, a mutually beneficial system. I feel that it is precisely this which will become the predominant feature of the nineties.

[Zorin] Mr Nakasone, please.

[Nakasone] If we should speak of an international economy, then as Dr Kissinger noted, the level of interdependence is forever increasing. Economy without state borders is a phrase that we are using increasingly. This means that the world economy will develop progressively along the path of interdependence. I feel that, in connection with this, a problem arises: When will the ruble become convertible? The convertibility of the ruble will exert a strong influence on the world economy. I think that this will be achieved under conditions of harmony and compromise between the West and the East. I feel this problem will be of primary importance in the political sphere as well, and not be limited to the economy.

The second question is: How will mutual relations between the EEC and CEMA develop? In all likelihood the Common Market will become more cohesive and increase the level of its integration. For its part, the Soviet Union will have to adequately react to these developments and changes. It is possible the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries will embark on the path of further development of mutual dependence between the two economic communities.

[Zorin] Valentin Mikhaylovich, your turn.

[Falin] I think that in the upcoming years all will become more definitely and profoundly aware of the fact that all of us are part of a larger whole. Moreover, the solution to practically all international problems outside this whole is impossible. The solution of many national problems outside this whole is difficult as well. This is applicable to the political and economic areas. Within this context it appears that it will become increasingly clearer to both politicians and others that we cannot live with the old baggage of accumulated knowledge and wisdom. Broad approaches and a fresh and courageous search for new solutions to problems, which for various reasons were thought today and yesterday to be almost insurmountable, must be implemented. From now on and forevermore we are doomed to either live well together in peace or to end civilization through continued conflict.

[Zorin] Yevgeniy Maksimovich, please.

[Primakov] I think that the new political thinking which the Soviet Union is attempting to implement into the system of international relations gives rise to optimism. I think that the foundation of this optimism—the material foundation if you wish—in the upcoming years, will be the successes of our restructuring. I feel that by the middle of the next 5-year plan these successes will become very evident in the economy. Then the conditions also will be ripe for the convertibility of the ruble, increased opening up of the Soviet economy, and greater involvement in the international division of labor.

I would like to say that this optimism would be seriously enhanced if the West would embark on restructuring its relations with us. I would like to think that this will take place.

[Zorin] I would like to note that if a question like this had been asked by me at this table, say, 5 years ago, I rather think the degree of disagreement among us would have been significantly greater. Since nuances of opinions have been voiced, I would like to ask you, Valentin Mikhaylovich, to point out the areas of convergence and instances where differences still exist.

[Falin] Well, naturally, there are certain nuances. These nuances cannot be absent, because each of us carries within him his past, which we have already discussed. Each of us grew out of this past and carries it into the present and even into the future. This is why our Western capitalist collegues stressed the changes which can be expected, or which are sought, in the Soviet Union. I think this topic found an adequate response in the words of Yevgeniy Maksimovich. I shall continue Academician Primakov's argument: Restructuring cannot develop unilaterally in a multilateral and interconnected world. If it is to be based on one side acting while the other merely observes, then the world will not become the new world that we await.

But there are general things which I see in the following way. One should search for new, fresh ideas and boldly undertake their implementation. This idea, on its own, is not so new, because Paine, the American philosopher and author, said as early as the 18th century: If all previous experience does not suggest a solution to a situation, people should behave in a way as if they were the first thinking creatures on Earth.

[Zorin] Dr Kissinger, I believe that you wish to elaborate on this. Am I not mistaken?

[Kissinger] There, obviously, is a connection between domestic restructuring and the international situation. We have lived through almost 40 years of competition and even conflict between the United States and the Soviet Union, between the other countries and the Soviet Union, and between other countries and the United States. I was present at the historic speech made by General Secretary Gorbachev at the United Nations. I was sitting in the hall next to Mr Falin. Gorbachev proposed numerous important theoretical opinions on events that ought to be happening and how they ought to develop. The challenge for us lies in the question of how to implement these theoretical ideas into practice in certain areas.

The general secretary made some specific proposals regarding the true reduction of conventional arms. But he also made other conclusions, those about non-use of force among nations and that no nation has the right to dominate another nation. We now have to do together certain specific work in the areas where we can implement these ideas. For example, when the ruble becomes a convertible currency, we truly shall have an international economy and be able to organize a political structure which would further unite the entire world.

We should approach the solution of such tasks with goodwill on all sides and implement these principles in life.

[Zorin] I am very glad that Dr Kissinger touched upon the United Nations speech by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, because this speech, in my opinion, contains a new philosophical concept of the development of human society during the upcoming period. Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev emphasized that we presently have entered an epoch when the interests of all mankind are to be the foundation of progress, and the formula of development at the expense of someone else is becoming outdated. Mr Nakasone, do you, to some extent, share this philosophy?

[Nakasone] I agree. I have already mentioned relations between the EEC and CEMA and convertability of the ruble. I would like to comment on this.

With the appearance of Mr Gorbachev in the political arena, the world situation improved considerably. His restructuring and diplomacy impress me in many respects. I agree with him in the sphere of international economics, as well. I would like to see his concepts and policies achieve further success.

Recently agreements on conventional arms reduction, solutions of the human rights problem, and so forth, were reached in Vienna. The achievement of these agreements brings me great joy. I think that overall, development is taking place in a positive and favorable direction. In these situations the high ideals promoted by Mr Gorbachev cannot help but impress us. We also want to develop civilization in the interests of all mankind. However, to achieve these great goals, several bridges should, of course, be crossed.

There is the question of interrelations in Europe—relations between CEMA and the EEC, and the human rights problem. Of interest to Japan are the problems of the Korean peninsula, the Vietnam problem, and a whole range of problems related to the development of economic cooperation between Japan and the USSR.

In this respect and in the general context, it would be good to create in Asia a situation similar to that established in Europe. We are indeed able to create this situation, in particular to establish a kind of economic commonwealth.

Thus, in general the world situation and its development are changing in a positive direction. In this respect, Japan would very much like to do its part and cooperate with other countries.

[Zorin] Mr Kissinger, you are both a scientist and a political figure. We know about your book and are familiar with your activity as the head of American diplomacy. I would like to ask you—both as a scientist and a political figure—the same question: Do you share the concept that we have entered the epoch when the interests of all mankind should be the basis for progress and that the formula of development at the expenses of others is becoming outdated?

[Kissinger] Upon the completion of Gorbachev's UN speech, a member of the Soviet delegation asked me what I considered the most important aspect of the speech. At that moment, everyone's attention was drawn to specific proposals on arms reduction. Of course, these are important. My answer, however, was that I thought the philosophical section of the speech to be the most important, because it proposed an approach that obviously differed from the usual ones, different from all that was heard in the past.

You referred to my historical research. History attests to the fact that nations at all times compete and try to achieve their own success at another nation's expense. We are now discussing precisely an attempt to reject competition of this kind and approach international relations from the point of view of mutual benefit. This demands a change in approaches both by the Soviet and the American sides, as well as by the Japanese side. All these countries must change their approach. However, this should be done with consideration of specific situations—mere declarations will not do. The new approach lies precisely in this. Indeed, we should apply it to specific situations. I hope this is precisely what will happen when the new administration takes its place in Washington. On the one hand, it will happen in the U.S. Administration and, on the other hand,—in the Soviet Government.

[Falin] I think Mr Kissinger gave a very accurate description of the impressions of, and the first spontaneous reaction to, Mikhail Sergeyevich's United Nations speech, because he himself witnessed it. Mr Kissinger characterized the philosophical section of the speech as the most important and that with the most lasting effects.

Indeed, the speech outlined a long-term program because the changes described therein, the construction of a new, peaceful world order, cannot be accomplished immediately by waving a magic wand. This would not be possible, and it will not and cannot happen.

However, for us to cover the distance that separates us from a more humane, stable, and sensible world, efforts and mutually agreed upon or parallel actions are needed. A common task and a common goal are needed. If today we can understand the words of Mr Kissinger and Mr Nakasone to mean that this aim is appearing, that our movement sees the path along which we will not get lost once again, then this in itself is cause for hope.

The thing is that contrary to the past—it is not the first time after all that we face a situation in which a choice must be made, a very responsible choice—contrary to the past, today we do not have the right to make a mistake. If 40 years ago we could conduct experiments, test different paths along which more often than not competition prevailed rather than cooperation, which took second, third, or even 10th place, today this method is forbidden because confrontation, which as a rule, always stems from competition, can put us on the edge of an abyss or push us into an abyss.

Consequently, today the gravity of every one of our decisions, made individually or jointly, every step taken or not taken when such a step was possible, acquires particular value, and we, all of us who to some extent are participants in preparing this decision, or at least are witnesses to the decision, bear particular responsibility in this regard.

[Zorin] I would like to seize on a phrase expressed by Dr Kissinger in order to attempt to discover one of his secrets. It is widely known that you, Doctor, have maintained close and good relations with the new U.S. President for a long time now. This is no secret, anywhere in the world. Now, in connection with this, I would like to ask: You will probably be sharing, and may have already shared your views with him, particularly on the future of Soviet-U.S. relations, so could you reveal your secret and tell the Soviet television viewers what your advice was?

[Kissinger] What can I tell the Soviet television viewers? That I have already had three very extensive conversations with the new President with the participation of the new Secretary of State and the new national security adviser. And I am convinced that all of them, and especially the new President, adhere to the idea of introducing fundamental changes in the political relations between the Soviet Union and the United States. They want to work on this most seriously.

My own view, which I have often written about, is that up to now we have spoken mainly about weapons, how to reduce them, to control them, and how to verify them. These are very technical matters. We must work at reducing and eliminating political causes for the existence of these weapons. If we can make progress on this issue then the question of arms will also become much easier. I do not want to go into detail now, but I think it would be correct to say that this fundamental philosophy is shared by both the new President and his closest advisers.

[Primakov] On this issue, if I may, I both agree and disagree with Dr Kissinger. Why do I agree? I agree that all political problems which require solution and which divide us must be involved in the exchange of relations between the two countries. Sometimes they even put us on different sides of the barricades. On the other hand, I would not contrapose all of this to efforts being made to reduce arms, and I do not consider this to be a purely technical question. [Falin whispers to Zorin: "I will object."]

Arms reduction is the main direction for moving away from the line on which the world is standing today, or from where it was standing even closer to this line some 3 or 4 years ago. You know, I recall when I was in Geneva—I was among those, including Valentin Mikhaylovich Falin, who accompanied Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev—and at the time I recall how the U.S.

President put the question, at first, mainly before Geneva. At the time it was put as follows: First, let us prove confidence between the two countries, first let us decide the issue of human rights and international conflicts, and then we will proceed to disarmament. For one who is engaged in this sphere, for example, this order of things does not satisfy me. I think we should move in all directions and we in fact moved in all directions, keeping in mind the main direction—the reduction of arms. And we achieved something in this regard.

[Kissinger] I did not say that we should first do one thing and then the other. We should do the main thing; we must solve the main issues—political, economic, and military—simultaneously. I do not mean that we must establish trust first and then act. I do not think you can work on trust in a purely abstract way. You must work on specific problems. I am not saying that we should not reduce weapons or talk about arms reduction. There is a dialogue on weapons, it exists, and it should continue. A political dialogue, on the other hand, should be elevated to the same level of the present military dialogue. Very soon it should be accompanied by an economic dialogue. That is my idea.

[Primakov] After that explanation, I agree.

[Falin] This is precisely how Dr Kissinger always understood the problem, and I can confirm this on the basis of a whole series of conversations with him. I think that our somewhat common experience in talks on extremely major and difficult problems in the past indicates that this could be the only productive method for solving particularly difficult and particularly delicate issues.

It seems to me that if we do not determine the common character of fundamental aims, or at least ensure that these aims do not exclude one another, then talks on even particular, very important, and very acute issues can eventually fail to produce results and the effect that both our sides—and I state this as a gratifying fact—strive for today.

[Zorin] Mr Nakasone, please.

[Nakasone] What a wonderful address General Secretary Gorbachev delivered at the UN General Assembly session. This speech was magnificent, and I think that with it he earned the right to be called a pioneer, if you will, of a new stage in world history. From the Japanese point of view, as an Asian country, there has been too great an emphasis on Europe in world politics, and somewhat less attention has been paid to Asian affairs.

After all, much more was undertaken in Europe. Various measures on confidence building were adopted there, and as a result great successes were achieved. Yet problems also exist in Asia. Take the problems of the Korean peninsula, Vietnam, and Indonesia, for example. Nevertheless, corresponding measures have not been adopted to create conditions for improving the general situation. Of course, we are not to sure of what to do specifically regarding Asia. Everything is rather vague and not quite definite. However, Japan, the Korean peninsula, Vietnam, and other problems must be solved one after another and a common climate established that will permit further progress. Take arms reduction, in particular: In Europe, the Soviet Union has announced a reduction of 500,000 troops. But, as far as Asia is concerned, with the exception of a withdrawal of Soviet troops from Mongolia, there has been no mention yet of any significant reduction of Soviet armed forces deployed in Asia. We are most interested, from this point of view, in what specific measures in this sphere can be found in the Soviet leadership's plans.

[Falin] I think there is an accidental mistake here, and I would like to correct it right away. A unilateral step reducing Soviet armed personnel and corresponding weapons by 500,000 is not a reduction that concerns Europe alone. Of the 500,000 there are 240,000 officers and men who will be withdrawn or demobilized in the European part of the country; 200,000 will be the number by which the complement of Soviet armed forces in the Asian part will be reduced, and 60,000 will be withdrawn from the southern parts of the country. Consequently, if we compare 240,000 with 200,000, then the difference is not all that great, and obviously here we have not forgotten Asia. It is another question whether or not more could be done. Possibly a lot more could be done on the basis of collective efforts and on the basis of a clearing up and utilization of those objective prerequisites that have formed today for major decisions in this sphere.

If the Japanese Government, as well as some other governments of this region are ready, then, as it follows from Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's speeches in Vladivostok and Krasnoyarsk as well as in Delhi, the Soviet side is fully capable and most interested in carrying out a thorough and businesslike discussion.

[Primakov] I would like to add a few words, if you will permit me. You must understand that Asia, the Asian part of the Soviet Union and the areas close to it, is not just another part of the Soviet Union; it is also part of the global situation. That is why I feel that we should consider all measures that can be implemented by us in Asia. What I have in mind is the reduction of arms within a certain context, which include the existence of American bases on Japanese territory as well. There is also a very strong American presence in South Korea and, as is well-known, there are bases in the Philippines. Clearly, if quantity is to be considered, then the U.S. naval forces have superiority. We are often accused of speedily and dynamically developing our Navy. But we are far from achieving the level of the United States. As you know, and Dr Kissinger knows this particularly well, as far as the United States is concerned, its Navy is the sacred cow which no one wishes to touch and which, under no circumstances, can be reduced. At times, we in the Soviet Union, are told that we are not a maritime power. First, I do not agree with the premise that we are not a naval power. Secondly, this logic is faulty because if that was the case, we would have been building up our land-based forces which prevail and dominate over all others. But we are reducing the strength of our land-based forces.

[Nakasone] As I said before, I was speaking about the Far East, particularly the Soviet Maritime Kray. I also had in mind the reduction of Soviet forces deployed in the Mongolian People's Republic. I know this. What I had in mind is the reduction of Soviet forces in the Far East, particularly the Maritime Kray. The American military presence is not limited to Europe, but is also close to us in Asia. On the other hand, we have no specific information regarding the Soviet naval forces. We don't even specifically know the whereabouts of the USSR naval bases, and so forth. We would very much like this information made public so that we can understand what is what. From our point of view Vladivostok is seen merely as an active naval base. It appears that it has no economic or cultural significance. Certainly, we could be wrong. But if that is the case, provide us with information.

[Falin] I most certainly do feel that you are somewhat in error. Vladivostok is not merely a naval base. It is also an industrial as well as a scientific base. Moreover, the scientific base encompasses theoretical and fundamental sciences. It is also the cultural center of our Far East, the Maritime Kray. Therefore, not everything about Vladivostok can be reduced to naval buildup or naval activity. Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev raised the question of opening the city and turning it, in essence, into a free harbor. This is the prospect of the upcoming years, the near future, and there are no reasons to believe that this decision will not be fulfilled.

On the question of availability of data, I feel that the question pertaining to the military activity is just, and in the next few days very detailed data on the correlations of East-West forces in the European region—providing figures to the last officer and man—will be published. Similarly, the publication of data regarding other regions is on the agenda. In principle, I see no difficulty that this data on correlation of forces—obviously I am not talking about only our forces—to the extent that it is known to us, should not become accessible to our foreign partners, particularly our neighbors, and to our own public. This question will be solved in the very near future.

[Zorin] Mr Nakasone, I only wish to point out that if you acquaint yourself with what the Soviet press has been saying lately, you will see that the Soviet public, within the framework of glasnost which exists in our country, is asking the very same question that you have just asked. I think that Dr Kissinger wishes to say something.

[Kissinger] I think that the politicians of our countries have been working, primarily, on the question of nuclear disarmament. Certainly, this is a difficult question, but we must remember that what we are discussing here are merely a few categories of armaments—five, six, or seven. We are not talking presently about all categories. These categories are comparable. They are not identical, but they can be compared. But when we speak of the problem of conventional arms, then the problem, from the intellectual point of view, becomes very much more complicated. For example, you could, roughly speaking, say that if the numbers are approximately equal on both sides, then the possibility of one side attacking the other is limited, if not totally absent. With conventional weapons quite often—and history tells of this—the weaker side has often defeated the stronger side. Therefore, equality of numbers in no way guarantees stability. In reaching agreement we should consider where these forces are deployed, the degree of their mobility, to where they can be transferred, and the existing reserves. I have no precise answers to all of these questions. I would be surprised if the Soviet side has precise answers to all these questions. If you were to consider Napoleon's victories before he marched on to Moscow, his forces were always smaller than those of his opponent. So were the German forces during their period of victory. Thus, numbers alone determine nothing.

A naval war is even more complicated. We know all too well what can happen in sea battles when one side achieves complete victory. Generally speaking, the equivalent of trench warfare does not occur at sea. Long ago a proposal was made to establish a relationship between French, British, and Japanese naval forces. But now experts are saying that the establishment of such an alignment of forces brought with it more harm than good. I am not saying that there is no need to discuss the possibility of reducing naval forces. We should most certainly be discussing this. But there is a hierarchy of intellectual preparation to the solution of these questions. In this context, nuclear disarmament made greater progress. We are only beginning to discuss conventional disarmament. As far as naval forces are concerned, I feel that at this stage we are lacking a serious approach to this problem. Perhaps we should first jointly research, at an academic level, the question of naval forces before making proposals at the diplomatic level. Candidly, I don't know what I would propose at this stage if somebody asked me.

[Primakov] Alright, I agree with you that the problem is very complex. But if we were to directly concentrate our attention on, let us say, confidence measures regarding naval forces, then this too would become a very important breakthrough if agreement can be reached. The Soviet side has made appropriate proposals, but unfortunately, the United States has not, as yet, given a positive reaction to these proposals.

[Zorin] What have you in mind?

[Primakov] What I have in mind is first to withdraw naval forces from certain areas. What I have in mind is to inform each other of any movements, to implement certain contacts at the fleet command levels, and so forth. As you can understand, all this is very important. If progress could somehow be achieved in this direction, then I feel that, as you have correctly noted, perhaps it would lead to the lessening of suspicion on both sides of a naval buildup with the aim of beginning action.

[Falin] Dr Kissinger raised two questions here. The question of conventional arms as such, and the question of naval forces. I think that the proposal to conduct a serious joint scientific research and analysis deserves every consideration and support. In order to decide anything, first we must know; in order to draw the necessary conclusions, material must first be collected. In regard to conventional arms, the elemental aspect of stockpiling over decades is making itself known. Particularly because the expenditure on conventional arms is 5 to 7 times greater than on nuclear forces. These armaments are particularly expensive and at times significantly more difficult to control. But if the question has been raised and it becomes more difficult as it develops, than I feel that the only correct conclusion to this situation could be the decision to, as quickly as possible, begin the essential examination of the problem. Water will not run under an embedded rock. The longer we relegate this problem to the future, the more difficult it will be to find a solution to it. Within this context, I warmly welcome the decision on the mandate adopted recently in Vienna, in the Conference of 23. I also feel that the following should be said about conventional armament: Conventional armaments, in their development, are approaching the level when they will become comparable to nuclear arms in their destructive ability. If technology in this field continues to be perfected, then the two problems will fuse eventually. Will must forestall this development, especially if one bears in mind that if research is inordinately expensive, then multiplication of the results of research can be achieved not only by the medium-developed countries but even by underdeveloped countries. It becomes merely a matter of procedure.

[Kissinger] I agree with Dr Falin on the technical issue of increasing the killing capability of conventional weapons and improving their accuracy. In some spheres these weapons are beginning to merge. This is a very important question.

[Falin] Another point, if I may, in the context of what you have said, about nuclear weapons: Yes, maybe in fact we have gone further here. However, an understanding of the danger here is not identical to the danger itself. Now we have spoken about the number of warheads and compared this number with 1965 and 1963. We forget that today one nuclear warhead, compared to those days, is three to five times more effective. Therefore, to understand the threat represented by today's figures, we must multiply them three to five times to compare them with the situation on the basis of which, after analyzing it, you, Dr Kissinger, and President Nixon proposed ideas on preventing nuclear war at the end of the 1960's and early 1970's.

[Kissinger] This is true. I was in Moscow and attended the signing of the first SALT agreement. Since then we have signed several more treaties. Yet, after a 50-percent reduction there will be more warheads remaining on both sides than there were after the first SALT agreement.

[Zorin] Mr. Nakasone.

[Nakasone] Maybe that is enough about nuclear weapons? Maybe we should talk about the lives of people. You know I have heard much in the Soviet Union about joint enterprises, including those that produce consumer goods. However, I think that maybe before producing more itself, it should import surpluses of these goods of which there are large quantities outside the Soviet Union. At the same time I must speak frankly about what is happening. As far as the Soviet market is concerned, Western businessmen experience a sense of uncertainty, and this relates in particular to the absence of a convertible ruble and also to a lack of price reforms.

Possibly in a year or two this reform will be carried out, but what will happen during the interim period? After all, lawsuits and controversies may arise, and how will contentious issues be solved at the level of joint enterprises, and with Soviet enterprises? These problems linked with the interim period need interpretation, amplification, and explanation. What do you think, Academician Primakov?

[Zorin] What does the director of the World Economics Institute have to say to this?

[Primakov] Yes, well, I agree that the situation is difficult and that our partners have certain doubts and fears. This is a natural state of affairs, because we began this experiment with mixed companies fairly recently, although you cannot call it an experiment because now this is already one of the practical trends. Maybe if we take a retrospective view on many of our actions, then they too, did not have much trust in us; that ought to be stated directly. However, I think that now everything is being done to really advance this trend. Many innovations are already being implemented. For example, previously the proportion of participation of foreign capital was set only at the 50-50 level...

[Falin, interrupting] Or 49-51.

[Primakov] Yes, 49-51, in our favor. Now we have retreated from this. If we talk about guarantees for foreign capital, well they are based on law; it is guaranteed by law in the Soviet Union. I think this form has a future. However, if you raise the question, Mr Prime Minister, about the import of consumer goods essential to the Soviet Union, then, as an economist, I can tell you that, of course, a part of our needs must be satisfied through imports. However, I would categorically advise against relying on imports as a means for covering our needs in consumer goods, because this puts us in the situation of a government that will have to literally, in just a matter of a few years, pay out possibly all of its foreign exchange earnings in the form of interest.

This is a very complicated matter. The main solution to the question, of course, lies in creating an internal mechanism, in changing the internal economic situation in such a way as to sharply increase the consumption of goods essential for the population and services.

[Falin] If you permit, I would like to recall the words Mikhail Sergeyevich said when he met with you; namely, that there are two prerequisites for the Soviet Union's organic fusion with the world economic process. The first requires a scientific and technical revolution, scientific and technical transformations within the Soviet economy itself; and the second, the convertibility of the ruble. Only after these two conditions have been met can our cooperation with any other country become stable and rest on a firm foundation. A clear and reliable confidence then will appear in this cooperation; without this, capital will never seek a sphere of application beyond its national borders.

It was my impression that you agreed with this assessment and that you considered it realistic. How long will this take? If we look at the scientific and technical side of the matter, then the process of transformation in our economy will proceed at a rapid rate, insofar as this is a genuine and natural need. Invested capital will soon give a return. This is a question of the immediate future. As far as convertibility of the ruble is concerned, as our leader has told you, the problem of our internal convertibility must first be resolved; in other words, the possibility for Soviet businessmen, particularly Soviet cooperatives and citizens, to purchase convertible currency for Soviet rubles. This task has been set, and it has been set in a purely practical way, not a theoretical one. It too will be solved.

[Nakasone] I have a question. In order to set up joint enterprises and to get the goods exchange and goods turnover moving, middlemen or brokers are necessary. This category of businessmen plays a very big role in our economy. Some of our specialists say that it appears that you still do not have a recognized legal status for this middleman. You know, these brokers play the role of hormones and vitamins in our economy.

[Primakov] You are correct in this. Yes, you are correct. We need brokerage firms, consultating....

[Falin, interrupting] Consulting companies.

[Primakov continues] ...consulting and information companies and others engaged in marketing. We have a need for them and we will establish them. But, take even our institutes. I can tell you now, for example, that we are working on agreements or have achieved agreement on intentions—this means that part of the way has been covered—with the Banco Commercialle, the Commercial Bank in Milan, and the Olivetti Company to establish a joint company that will collect the corresponding information and provide the data in which they are interested to our enterprises, as well as to Italian and other West European enterprises.

[Falin] Objectively, in fact, this is the way development should proceed. The main commodity today is information, information in all its forms. Our scientists say that by the end of the century 95 percent of any consumer product, for production or civilian use, will consist of software, of knowledge, and only about 5 percent will consist of energy and the raw materials used in its production. If this is the case, then the engineering and consulting companies, those companies that accumulate the highest achievements of world experience, world science, and world management experience, will be irreplaceable in any modern, structured, and flourishing economy. The example of Japan and a number of other countries attests to this. We want to learn, and you have probably noticed that we have been learning fairly intensively. I should add, however, that here we have the greatest number of deficiencies. We must overcome the biggest gap here in our restructuring.

[Nakasone] This means that presently the provisions of the status of the latter are not legally recognized. In the future they will be legally recognized, and then the brokers will be able to work.

[Primakov] Why? I think that they can be established even now, and are being established.

[Falin, interrupting] There are no obstacles.

[Primakov] There are no obstacles, and they can be established like any joint company.

[Falin] And they even exist.

[Primakov] Many of them exist. I have just cited an example whereby we have formed such....

[Kissinger, interrupting] May I make one point. I am not a businessman and I have no business interests in the Soviet Union; I have never conducted business in the Soviet Union. But my friends, who want to conduct business here, tell me that, of course, the laws have been considerably improved now. But it is extremely difficult to break through your bureaucracy. They have no idea who is responsible for the law. Any help that can be organized, any system that will simplify an understanding of what is very complicated in the USSR would be very helpful.

[Primakov] That is correct.

[Falin] I agree with you, Mr Kissinger. If the armor of our tanks and the armor of our battleships was made of bureaucrats, then they would be invincible.

[Primakov, laughing] They are invincible now, but with bureaucrats they would be even stronger.

[Kissinger] I have heard that even some Soviet citizens do not always understand how the Soviet bureaucracy works. I do not know how true this is.

[Zorin] I even allow that the bureaucracy itself does not always comprehend how it works....

[Falin, interrupting] And why it works.

[Zorin] Yes, and why it works. I think that the discussion we have held attests to the great number of topics we have to discuss. Their number is considerably larger than we can embrace in the short time of our broadcast. As our time is coming to an end, I would like to ask each participant to say something of their own choice to our multi-million audience, something to conclude our discussion. Let us start with you, Dr Kissinger.

[Kissinger] In the last few days, I have had the privilege of meeting with your top leaders, beginning with Mikhail Gorbachev. I was impressed by the sincerity with which they discussed questions of economic progress and of peace. I think that we will succeed in strengthening our peace and that all people will gain from what your leaders propose, if this mood prevails.

[Nakasone] First of all, in connection with the disaster in Armenia, I would like to express my deep condolences to and compassion with all Soviet people, particularly the Armenian people. I would also like to express my gratitude for the condolences sent to us in connection with the demise of the emperor. We would like to develop our relations both politically and economically, in a comprehensive manner. The Japanese people hope that the upcoming visit of General Secretary Gorbachev to Japan will take place. He is impatiently awaited in Japan. General Secretary Gorbachev is currently a world figure, and I am confident that if he visits Japan he will be met with the same hospitality with which he has been met in other countries. We would like him to visit Japan as early as possible.

[Falin] I think that today's meeting, as well as the Moscow visit of the Trilateral Commission in general, confirms the need for more frequent discussion, without avoiding the most complex and acute questions. We will, much more so than in the past, strive to be both students and teachers to one another. If we view the situation in each country with open eyes, then we will always be able to find something that ought to be considered, even as a not particularly positive experience. But the main thing, however, is that we are gradually learning the tradition of discussion, of mutual understanding and respect for each other's sacred thoughts and not just the usual and known considerations. If this was almost impossible yesterday, then today and tomorrow it will be unavoidable and absolutely necessary.

[Zorin] Yevgeniy Maksimovich.

[Primakov] First of all, as a participant in today's meeting, I would like to express my sincere gratitude. The very high assessment of our leader made by two men so greatly experienced in political questions has made a great impression on me. In my opinion, this is very important. I would also like to thank Mr Nakasone for the condolences he has expressed to our people who have suffered from the truly great tragedy in Armenia. You see how many things already unite us. I think that we are now not so much arguing with one another as much as we are coming to some common conclusions. This is the starting point for implementing those...maybe they are still slogans, maybe they are just wishes, but the future of mankind essentially depends on their implementation.

[Zorin] I think that our viewers have listened with great interest to the opinions expressed here by competent Soviet representatives. The viewers no doubt have showed great interest in the unusual appearance—it is not every day that they can see such people as Dr Kissinger and Mr Nakasone on their screens. I think that they have listened to them with great interest. It only remains for me to thank you for participating in this discussion and to express the hope, Mr Kissinger, Mr Nakasone, and my colleagues, that this is not the last time that we will meet here for a similar discussion in Studio 9. Thank you.

United States & Canada

U.S. Must Meet Sino-Soviet Summit With 'Maturity'

LD3101094589 Moscow TASS in English 0828 GMT 31 Jan 89

[Text] Moscow January 31 TASS—By TASS diplomatic correspondent:

The report "How the United States Should Prepare for the Sino-Soviet Summit", issued by the American Heritage Foundation, comments on Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze's forthcoming visit to the People's Republic of China.

What are the conclusions and recommendations offered by the Heritage Foundation to the American Administration? The report says that nothing frightening has happened: Sino-Soviet relations are being normalized, but the significance of Beijing as a counterweight to the USSR is not so great now in the general context of American foreign policy. However, it is proposed that a close eye be kept on changes in the character of such an important component of world politics as Soviet-Chinese relations.

The Heritage Foundation recommends that the U.S. Administration should let Beijing and Moscow know that a formal Soviet-Chinese alliance would be unacceptable to the United States, that military cooperation between them could lead to a reappraisal of U.S. relations with both countries. It is proposed that in relations with the Chinese emphasis should be placed on "a Soviet military threat", and the U.S. should more actively (?cooperate) in information exchange and even intelligence.

It is certainly difficult to say how the new administration would receive these recommendations. One would naturally like to ascribe a greater maturity of political thinking to the U.S. Administration. There are now new realities in the world and in the so-called USSR-USA-China triangle, and one should take them into consideration not only in words but also in deeds.

The new period in international relations is characterised, among other things, by many countries' growing realisation of their genuine national interests, and a steady improvement in the relations between the two neighbouring great socialist powers undoubtedly meets their fundamental interests.

As to possibilities of manipulations and manoeuvres within the "triangle" framework in the interests of any country, they would gradually be on a decline. It appears that neither in Moscow nor in Beijing will they regret this: The leaders of both countries repeatedly stated that the improvement of relations between them was not directed against anybody. So Washington, too, should be thinking not in terms of triangular intrigue but in terms of creating multiangular structures and fair and equitable international relations.

Tower Ignores Arms Cuts, Pushes Military Build-up

LD3101000889 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 GMT 30 Jan 89

["International Diary" program presented by Andrey Ptashnikov]

[Text] [Ptashnikov] Since we have begun talking about the new U.S. Government, I would like to note that its members are becoming increasingly involved in political activity. Although no decisions have yet been made either in the sphere of foreign or domestic policy, quite a few statements have already been made. Furthermore, they have by no means always been reassuring or balanced.

For example, a report from Tokyo describes the clearly negative reaction in Japan to certain remarks by John Tower, who has been appointed the new U.S. defense secretary. The fact of the matter is that Tower, speaking at Senate confirmation hearings, demanded a significant increase in defense spending from the Japanese Government. He also called for changes to the present Japanese Constitution, in which a number of clauses restrict the build-up of this country's military might. So, an editorial article today in the newspaper THE DAILY YOMIURI writes that in the light of these remarks, it looks as if Tower does not regard Japan as an independent state. Meanwhile, according to UPI, an anonymous representative of the Japanese Foreign Ministry stated the following: Judging from what Tower has said, he still has much to learn about our relations in the area of mutual defense. The representative went on to point out that on several occasions recently, Washington has expressed its satisfaction, on the whole, with the development of U.S.-Japanese relations in this area. But now, I will ask my colleague and commentator, Igor Surguchev, to continue talking on this topic.

[Surguchev] As we can see, those in governmental circles in the land of the Rising Sun are not concealing their irritation over Tower's remarks, which are regarded there as inappropriate and unfortunate. The newspaper THE DAILY YOMIURI assesses them, and not without basis, as interference in the domestic affairs of Japan. However, the government of Takeshita has made no official response to the preaching from across the ocean and, what is more, has not rejected these remarks out of hand. This can be explained by the fact that Tower has not yet taken up the post of U.S. secretary for defense, and consequently is not expressing the view of the new U.S. Administration. However, this argument does not seem convincing against the background of the draft program of the Japanese ruling Liberal Democratic Party for the present year, which was made public in Tokyo on 28 January. It contains a direct appeal for a review of the country's post-war constitution, in the interests, so it is said, of ensuring genuine national independence. No matter what eloquent phrases the leadership of the LDP may juggle with, one can clearly see its poorly masked desire to revise the peace clauses of the fundamental law of Japan. So Tower's pieces of advice correspond in full to the intentions of the Japanese ruling circles. As far as defense spending is concerned, here too, Washington does not have to urge Tokyo on. Japan is steadily increasing defense expenditure anyway, for the third year running exceeding the roof of one percent of the gross national product, which was set by one of the country's post-war governments.

But judging from Tower's remarks, those across the ocean want the Japanese to make even greater strides along the path of militarization. Incidentally, the candidate for the post of Pentagon chief is also foisting this same path on the United States' NATO allies. Speaking at a NATO seminar on problems of defense in the West German city of Munich, Tower called for the modernization of the nuclear arsenal and the bloc's conventional weapons in Europe. In his words, procrastination in this matter would give the Soviet Union the opportunity to undermine the unity of NATO.

Though he has not yet officially taken up his post, John Tower is pushing the old line, fighting essentially for a continuation of the arms race. It looks as though this man is bound by the stereotypes which were formed during the sad period of the cold war. If his speeches do not reflect the course of the Bush administration, then they give sufficient grounds for judging the manner of thinking of the candidate for U.S. secretary for defense. This, unfortunately, is in no way in keeping with the new political thinking.

One gets the impression that Tower simply does not know, or does not wish to know, about the unilateral concrete measures to reduce troops and armaments recently announced by the USSR, the GDR, CSSR, Poland, Bulgaria, and Hungary. At a time when the Warsaw Pact countries are convincingly demonstrating their desire to ensure that their military might is defensive, are calling for the establishment of trust and cooperation between the states of the two opposing blocs, and are appealing to NATO to follow their example, the future Pentagon chief is speaking the language of confrontation, taking on the role of herald of the build-up and modernization of arms. What is this? The personal stance of John Tower, or something greater? We will not be hasty in replying to this question. As they say, we'll wait and see.

Soviet Television Interviews Jesse Jackson

LD3001220689 Moscow TASS in English 2152 GMT 30 Jan 89

[Text] Moscow January 31 TASS—In an interview with Soviet television Jesse Jackson, a well-known American politician and public figure, said that Mikhail Gorbachev's speech at the United Nations aims at reshaping all international relations since the race in nuclear-missile armaments, an enormous squandering of funds and resources, brought the entire world to the brink of catastrophe. He said Gorbachev's speech holds out hope and prospect to mankind. Jackson said he dreamed of hearing a similar speech from George Bush.

Speaking about the state and prospects for Soviet-American relations, Jackson noted that big positive changes shaped up in bilateral relations during the Reagan Administration's stay in office and, above all, as a result of summit meetings. The USSR and the United States shifted from the policy of animosity and threats to truly good relations, to taking account of each other's interests, and to concluding agreements on disarmament.

He said two important events in Soviet-American relations have already occurred during the short term of George Bush's presidency: the son and grandson of the American President have visited Armenia to express on behalf of the Americans sympathy with those who suffered from the earthquake. There was also a telephone conversation between Bush and Gorbachev. This is a solid indicator of the intention to expand good relations between the two countries, Jackson said.

Jackson arrived in the USSR on a mission of good will and mercy on the invitation of the Union of Soviet Societies of Friendship and Cultural Ties With Foreign Countries. During a meeting with Valentina Tereshkova, chairman of the Union Presidium, the sides discussed Jackson's proposals for expanding assistance to earthquake survivors in Armenia. The American public figure said the Soviet culture ministry and himself intended to clarify opportunities for developing a charity campaign to involve American and Soviet art workers.

China

Media Preview Shevardadze's Upcoming Visit to PRC

TASS Interviews Shevardnadze

LD3001235289 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 2220 GMT 30 Jan 89

[Text] Moscow, 31 Jan [TASS]—Here is the full text of USSR Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze's interview with a TASS correspondent:

Question: Tomorrow you leave for Beijing on an official visit. If one considers that a Soviet foreign minister has not visited the PRC for decades, then this alone makes your visit an extraordinary event. But there are other, more important aspects to it. How would you evaluate them?

Answer: To put it more precisely, this visit is the first official visit by a Soviet foreign minister to the PRC in the whole history of Soviet-Chinese relations. At one stage, the Moscow-Beijing route was marked by the great intensity of its traffic, yet it so happened that the foreign ministers did not exchange official visits.

Now, however, in the past 2 months alone, I have met my Chinese colleague, Comrade Qian Qichen, twice already—in Moscow and in Paris, and tomorrow in Beijing I shall meet him for the third time. And this growing intensity in our contacts corresponds—as we understand it—to our countries' desire to raise relations to a new and higher level.

This process has a terminological definition: the normalization of Soviet-Chinese relations. In other words, bringing them to a norm whose absence is, in general, abnormal in our time, all the more so for two such socialist countries, neighboring countries, as the USSR and the PRC. Both began moving toward this norm a long time ago, and not without success. The political dialogue is uninterrupted. Consultations and talks on border questions are underway. We are exchanging national exhibitions of our achievements, delegations of various levels and kinds; we are extending the sphere of cooperation in economics and trade and establishing direct contacts between regions and cities, institutions, and enterprises. One might imagine it to be a case of what else is wanted. Yet the potential of Soviet-Chinese relations is such that it is capable of providing immeasurably more for our peoples, the Asian region, and the world community as a whole. Meanwhile, this potential is far from being fully revealed; there are difficulties which, if not surmounted, will make it impossible to activate it to its full existing capacity.

Only a meeting of the highest leaders of our two countries, a Soviet-Chinese summit, is capable of lending the necessary boost for the complete—I stress—the complete normalization of Soviet-Chinese relations. And the significance of our visit to the PRC lies not the fact that it is the first visit, but in the fact that it, in essence, completes the preparations for the Soviet-Chinese summit meeting.

Question: In other words, you are leaving for Beijing confident that this meeting will take place?

Answer: The Soviet and the Chinese sides are vigorously working for it. We have identical views on exchanging visits in a consistent manner as a means to prepare the meeting. Our delegation is bringing proposals concerning the specific dates for holding the summit meeting and we intend to reach agreement on them with our partners. The preparations for the meeting are being carried out from the standpoint of attaining the greatest practical result and great effectiveness. This pertains both to the documents which might be signed during the meeting and the elaboration of principles on which our relations will be based, whether it is to turn our state frontiers into a zone of friendship and good-neighborliness, or a lessening of the military confrontation, or cooperation in settling regional conflicts. Even during the December 1988 visit to Moscow by my Chinese colleague, Comrade Qian Qichen, we did on the whole reach consensus on the specific directions of cooperation, which through the good offices of the foreign ministries of both countries ought to be translated into reality. These are: the economy; trade; science and technology; setting up joint enterprises; joint development in various regions; and all manner of exchanges, among which I would single out the exchange of knowledge and experience. The pride of place here belongs to experience of renewal, modernization, and restructuring—processes which are so vigorously transforming our countries.

Question: You have been speaking in the main about bilateral relations. But what if you take them in the international context? What questions of the international agenda can turn up within the field of vision of the participants of the Beijing talks?

Answer: There are two sides taking part in the talks, and I would not now like to place some kind of an order for a definite program of talks, even though one can talk with a greater or lesser degree of certainty about what the Soviet and Chinese sides find of equal interest. In general, it is the building of new international relations, the creation of a new worldwide political order with the emphasis on dialogue and cooperation, peace, and development—to be more specific, it is disarmament all along the line, beginning with nuclear and chemical, on to conventional disarmament, security in Asia, the settling of regional conflicts, and international cooperation in the struggle against global crisis phonemena, whether it is the problem of indebtedness or the threat to the physical integrity of the earth.

In conclusion, I will take the liberty of emphasizing again: A full normalization of Soviet-Chinese relations is valuable in itself for the sides, and no detriment of any kind to the interests of third countries is to be found in that.

Wu Xueqian Comments

LD3001225289 Moscow TASS in English 2241 GMT 30 Jan 89

[Text] Beijing January 31 TASS—By TASS correspondents Grigoriy Arslanov and Vladimir Kashirov:

Wu Xueqian, member of the Politburo of the Chinese Communist Party Central Committee and vice-premier of the State Council of the People's Republic of China, expressed the hope that the forthcoming meeting of the foreign ministers of China and the USSR would make a contribution to the cause of a just and sensible solution of the Kampuchean problem.

He made this statement during the meeting with Australian Minister for Foreign Affairs and Trade Gareth John Evans, now on a visit here, XINHUA news agency reports.

On Soviet-Chinese relations, Wu Xueqian noted that following the normalization of ties between the two countries, China and the Soviet Union would develop friendly, goodneighbourly relations based on the five principles of peaceful co-existence.

On Sino-American relations, the vice-premier of the State Council said that China and the United States paid immense importance to expanding bilateral ties, adding that a stable development of relations between the two countries was in the two nations' vital interests and that the cause of peace and stability the world over also stood to benefit from this.

PRC Press Comments Cited

LD3001200989 Moscow TASS in English 1818 GMT 30 Jan 89

[Text] Beijing January 30 TASS—The Chinese press prints these days many materials devoted to the Soviet Union's foreign and internal policies.

"The past year has witnessed meaningful progress in normalizing Sino-Soviet relations", the weekly BEIJING REVIEW writes today. "The forthcoming talks in Beijing between the two countries' foreign ministers are meant to expedite the normalization process and lay down the foundation for a full-scale summit meeting in the near future".

The press points out that the importance of the Soviet-Chinese dialogue goes far beyond the framework of bilateral ties and is a component part of the global tendency toward peace and development.

In the Chinese capital they note that the new thinking proposed by Gorbachev, which has established itself in Soviet diplomacy, led to the USSR'S enhanced prestige on the global scale and an amelioration of the international situation and also drastic changes in Soviet-Chinese relations.

IZVESTIYA Previews Visit

LD3001203389 Moscow TASS in English 1925 GMT 30 Jan 89

[Text] Moscow January 30 TASS—The USSR and the People's Republic of China vigorously take the necessary steps to bring Soviet-Chinese relations back into a normal channel, the newspaper IZVESTIYA writes today in view of the official visit to the People's Republic of China of Eduard Shevardnadze, member of the Politburo of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee and Foreign Minister of the USSR. The visit is due to take place on February 2-4.

The newspaper holds that 1988 became an important stage in fostering a full-scale dialogue which is historically orientated at friendship, cooperation and mutual understanding. This dialogue was launched during the visit, the first in thirty years, of Chinese Foreign Minister Qian Qichen to Moscow.

IZVESTIYA regards the understanding on holding a summit meeting between Comrades Mikhail Gorbachev and Deng Xiaoping in Beijing in the first half of this year as the main result of the Moscow meeting. This event is sure to signal the beginning of the new stage in Soviet-Chinese relations, will raise them to a qualitatively higher level, and will have a salutary impact on the international situation as a whole.

Speaking about his forthcoming high mission, the Soviet foreign minister stressed that "the wide range of issues drawn in Moscow should be filled with specific practical solutions," IZVESTIYA goes on. "We would like them to take the form of respective documents. For ultimately, the two visits—of Comrade Qian Qichen to Moscow and ours to Beijing—are meant to prepare the top-level meeting—productive in its results, [as received] in which our peoples are vitally interested and, I dare think, the world community too. We have all grounds to look into the future with optimism. This optimism has a real foundation."

'Peaceful Coexistence' Sought

LD3001223289 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1545 GMT 30 Jan 89

[From "The World Today" program presented by Vladimir Tsvetov]

[Text] Let us discuss Eduard Ambrosiyevich Shevardnadze's visit to China, which is to start on 1 February. I think the main purpose of the visit will be to set the time for the Soviet-Chinese summit talks and their agenda. It is expected that matters concerning the total normalization of Soviet-Chinese relations, disarmament, and issues linked to regional conflicts will be on the agenda of the meeting between Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and Deng Xiaoping. No doubt the situation in Indochina will be discussed.

In their letters to "The World Today," viewers often ask: Doesn't a total normalization of Soviet-Chinese relations indicate a return to the Treaty on Frendship, Alliance, and Mutual Aid, signed in 1950 and denounced in 1979? China says that there will be no return to the 50s, 60s, or 70s.

What do these points in time mean? In the 50s, China followed the course of Soviet policy, which we ourselves are now subjecting to strict critical analysis, in everything. In the 60s, ideological and political divergence arose between our countries, which even led to armed conflict over Damanskiy Island on the Ussuri River. The 70s were noted for the profound stagnation in our relations. So, in the view of the Chinese side, a return to the past is impossible. This, evidently, is correct. Most appropriate of all to the current stage would be Soviet-Chinese relations that are based on the principles of peaceful coexistence, good-neighborliness, and extensive cooperation.

Agenda for Talks Noted

OW3101101489 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 0600 GMT 28 Jan 89

[(Paboyan) report from Beijing]

[Text] In today's program let us look at Soviet-Chinese relations. After Moscow and Beijing announced that Soviet Foreign Minister Shevardnadze will make an official visit to China from 2 to 4 February, our reporter (Paboyan) dispatched the following report from the Chinese capital of Beijing:

Shevardnadze and Chinese Foreign Minister Qian Qichen will continue to discuss questions related to preparations for the meeting between the top leaders of the two countries. Their discussions in this regard began last December in Moscow.

According to a Chinese Foreign Ministry spokesman, Qian Qichen and Shevardnadze will also exchange views on other issues of mutual interest, and Chinese leaders will meet with the Soviet foreign minister. In answer to questions posed by reporters, this Chinese Foreign Ministry spokesman said that the meeting between the two foreign ministers will touch on the Cambodian issue. Public figures here said: Both countries hope to have this issue settled justly and reasonably at the earliest possible date. In international affairs, China and the Soviet Union hold similar positions on many issues and share the same view on the cardinal question of ensuring a lasting peace. We also stand for the cessation of arms race and will strive for the total destruction of all large-scale destructive weapons.

Beijing expresses satisfaction with the recent developments in the relations between China and the Soviet Union. Now, Soviet-Chinese ties cover practically all spheres of contacts between nations. There are more and more technical and economic cooperative projects. Contacts are expanding between the border regions of the two countries. Mass media here have emphatically pointed out that active progress of the relations between the Soviet Union and China, two big countries, is conducive to the healthy development of the situation in the Asia-Pacific region and in all other parts of the world.

Continuation of U.S. Policy on Taiwan Questioned

OW3001175589 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 0300 GMT 25 Jan 89

[Text] Listeners, 34 years ago on 25 January 1955, the U.S. Congress, acting on a proposal by then President Eisenhower, adopted a so-called Taiwan Resolution. Based on this resolution, the U.S. President acquired from Congress the power to use force against the PRC. On this, our station observer (Kavavayev) has the following comments:

As a matter of fact, the adoption of the Taiwan Resolution ensured the victory of those forces in the U.S. Government that advocated a hard-line policy against the PRC and regarded the Taipei regime as the sole government representing China. This document established a strong anti-China policy, which was pursued by Washington for a quarter of a century.

As is known to all, Washington withdrew its ambassador from Taipei following the establishment of diplomatic relations with the PRC in 1979. Shortly thereafter, however, it was found that this in no way meant that Washington renounced its military and political support for the Taipei authorities. In April 1979, Washington provided a new legal basis for such support—here I mean the U.S.-Taiwan Relations Act. This document ensured a persistent characteristic of U.S. policies; namely, all came down in one continuous line. It defined the commitments, including military commitments that Washington should fulfill to the Taipei authorities as an ally. In reality, this was to confront mainland China. Besides, the United States expressed that it would be faithful to its two-China policy.

What are the changes in the U.S. position in these years? Please answer this question by your own judgment. Recently while addressing the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the new U.S. Secretary of State Baker said that the U.S. Government taking office on 20 January confirmed that Washington would guarantee the security of the Taiwan authorities on the basis of the law adopted in April 1979. He stressed: We should be a reliable friend of Taiwan. The U.S. Government, Baker announced, is examining Taipei's request for selling a lot of weapons to it. Commenting on this, an official spokesman of the Pentagon said that the U.S. policy is aimed at helping boost the strength of Taiwan's Armed Forces. It appears that no consideration has yet been given at this time to the PRC's wish that the new U.S. Government will help hasten the solution of the Taiwan issue, for which conditions are already ripe.

Sino-Vietnamese Talks Focus on Cambodian Issue

OW3101023789 Moscow Radio Peace and Progress in Mandarin to Asia-Pacific Region 1300 GMT 23 Jan 89

[Station commentary]

[Text] Dinh Nho Liem, Vietnamese first deputy foreign minister, visited China last week. The visit has attracted immediate attention from political and social activists in this region. Many Asian countries' press circles are currently discussing this issue. Why has the visit attracted people's close attention? Please listen to this station's commentary on this:

Beijing and Hanoi had not had such a direct contact in the past 10 years. The two neighboring countries, which had kept friendly and good-neighborly relations with each other, have antagonized each other for years. There was firing on the Sino-Vietnamese border, and clashes over disputed islets in the South China Sea. The two sides also accused and threatened each other.

Cambodia is the cause of the contradiction. Vietnam supports the PRK Government, while China supports the opposition parties, including the Pol Pot elements. Chinese leaders had indicated that they would resolutely refuse to talk with Vietnamese representatives as long as Vietnamese troops stayed in Cambodian soil. However, Beijing's officials received guests from the Socialist Republic of Vietnam last week.

What were the reasons for this change? Conditions for such a breakthrough in Sino-Vietnamese relations came into being gradually. Various parties involved in the Cambodian conflict have understood that it is impossible to solve the conflict by military means. The people of China, Indochinese countries, and other Southeast Asian countries have been tired of the bloody war and antagonism. Soviet-Chinese relations have improved. The Soviet Union and China are preparing for a summit. Above all, the overall world situation has improved as well. New political thinking is accepted more and more by statesmen and by people of various countries. All of these have softened China's and Vietnam's positions, and have helped contribute to their search for a possible compromise. The situation along the Sino-Vietnamese border has, to a large extent, returned to normal. Border trade has begun.

On 6 January 1989, the People's Republic of Kampuchea and the Socialist Republic of Vietnam announced a decision that Vietnamese troops would be completely withdrawn from Cambodia before September this year, if a political agreement on the Cambodian issue is achieved. China has welcomed this announcement. Furthermore, when ending his recent visit to France, Chinese Foreign Minister Qian Qichen said: China will support neither the Khmer Rouge's policy nor its return to Phnom Penh to assume (?exclusive) political power. This succession of recent events created the possibility of Dinh Nho Liem's visit to China.

The two sides reportedly discussed the normalization of Sino-Vietnamese relations, preparations for Vietnamese Foreign Minister Nguyen Co Thach's visit to China, and other issues of common interest, although the talk was held secretly. Of course, they also discussed situations surrounding Cambodia.

After the visit, a spokesman for the Vietnamese Ministry of Foreign Affairs said: It is beneficial to exchange opinions with each other. The exchange of opinions was conducted in a candid and friendly atmosphere. The two sides have achieved a series of agreements.

Concerning the Cambodian issue, the spokesman said: The two sides only discussed the international aspect of the issue. As for internal matters, they will be solved by the various Cambodian parties themselves.

Of course, Beijing and Hanoi remain divergent on how to solve the Cambodian issue and on bilateral relations. However, China and Vietnam have taken the correct road of sitting at a conference table to solve issues through political means. This is supported by the whole world.

Northeast Asia

Japanese Military Budget Increase 'Perplexing'

LD3001182389 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1054 GMT 30 Jan 89

[Text] Khabarovsk, 30 Jan (TASS)—Last year was marked by a considerable stepping up of bilateral trade, economic, and business ties between the USSR and Japan, Yuriy Bakulin, director of the Far East Institute of Mineral Raw Materials and Lenin prizewinner, said to a TASS correspondent. Cooperation between the scientists of the two countries is also expanding.

As an example of the development of effective cooperation he cited the joint Soviet-Japanese compilation of a map of volcanic-tectonic structures of Eastern Asia. Participating in this are researchers from the Far East Institute of Mineral Raw Materials. The recommendations of the scientists studying the regions's mineral and raw materials base are being used in projects for joint Soviet-Japanese enterprises.

However, certain recent steps by the Japanese side are perplexing, Yuriy Bakulin observed. The Japanese Government's decision to increase the country's military budget by 6 percent is obviously contrary to the positive tendencies which have taken shape in the development of bilateral relations.

"During the recent meeting between Mikhail Gorbachev and members of the 'Trilateral Commission', it was stated quite definitely by the Soviet side that the USSR'S military contingent in the Far East would be reduced by 200,000 men," the Soviet scientist said. "In this connection it seems illogical to have a situation where one neighboring country is disarming while the other, on the contrary, is building up its military might."

It is to be regretted that the efforts of the Japanese Government are directed not to seeking ways for further development of mutually beneficial cooperation between the USSR and Japan, but toward building up military potential, Yuriy Bakulin stressed.

Japanese Hints of 'Diplomacy Through Force' Noted

LD3001164189 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0730 GMT 30 Jan 89

[Boris Andrianov "Mayak" commentary]

[Text] As the KYODO news agency reports from Tokyo, the congress of the ruling Liberal-Democratic Party is to be held there tomorrow. The draft program of action for the party in 1989, which was published on the eve of the congress, has been submitted for its consideration. The Liberal-Democratic forum will endorse this document, which determines a continued strengthening of ties with the United States as the key element in official Tokyo's diplomacy. A Mayak commentary. At the microphone is Boris Andrianov.

[Andrianov] There can be no doubt that every country has the right to choose suitable partners for itself in international affairs. It is also important to be aware of what aims are being pursued in doing this, all the more so in our times, when positive changes are taking place on the international scene. Quite definite improvements are now apparent in curbing the arms race and in settling regional conflicts. In contrast to former times, signs of readiness have appeared on the part of the United States and its West European allies to attend further talks with the Soviet Union on problems pertaining to reducing the threat of nuclear war. The results of the recent Vienna meeting of countries participating in the Helsinki process are also encouraging.

Nonetheless, it would be politically naive to appraise the global situation through rose-tinted spectacles. Indeed, it is far from everyone abroad who is ready to recognize the new reality of international life and to review their former attitudes toward the Soviet Union. The new thinking has not yet become an essential requirement for a certain category of political leaders in the capitalist world. In my opinion, the representatives of official Tokyo take a special place within such conservatively minded circles. Judge for yourselves: the draft program of action which is to be submitted for endorsement by the Liberal-Democratic Congress tomorrow talks about a desire to establish stable relations with the Soviet Union on the basis of mutual understanding. It would seem that we are talking about a thaw in bilateral affairs, about a normalization of links between the two countries. However, the very same document demonstrates that at the very same time the Liberal-Democratic Party of Japan intends to maintain a hard line, as before, making demands of the Soviet Union and adopting the conclusion of a bilateral peace treaty directly dependent upon the satisfaction of these.

How are we to assess this? It seems very much as if, by taking such a stance, official Tokyo is quite frankly hinting that it will be relying on diplomacy through force, making this the basis of Japan's policy with respect to our country. Warmth does not come from such an approach—rather, at the very least, a chill. Nor does another provision of this document inspire optimism: Its authors call directly for a review of Japan's postwar constitution, substantiating their call with some kind of need to ensure real national independence. In the view of observers in Tokyo, this wording is no more than undoubted camouflage. It has been thought up in order to disguise, first and foremost, a desire to revise the clauses on peace in the country's fundamental law which, to a certain extent, restrain a buildup of military might in the Land of the Rising Sun. One can only be astounded by how divorced from the realities of the present time the Japanese leaders are, at a time when the world needs new politics, built on the new thinking and new approaches, and on a serious attitude toward the realities of the international situation.

ROK Group Asked To Build Moscow Trade Center

SK2901024889 Seoul THE KOREA TIMES in English 29 Jan 89 p 6

[Text] The Soviet Union has formally requested Ssangyong Construction to build a mammoth trade center in Moscow in the form of a joint venture.

The Soviet request was made Friday when Kim Sok-won, chairman of the Ssangyong group, met three high ranking government officials at his office to discuss economic and trade exchanges with the Soviet Union.

The three Soviet officials, who arrived in Seoul on Thursday at Kim's invitation, are Vladimir Prokopov, president of the All Union Publishing and Printing Association; Aleksandr V. Vornozov, senior researcher at the Academy of Science; and Mikhail M. Steklov, consultant at the Chamber of Commerce and Industry.

Sources at Ssangyong said that they asked Ssangyong Construction to build a trade center with 70 to 80 storys in the Soviet capital in a meeting with Kim.

They added that the three Soviet officials also requested Ssangyong to provide a commercial loan for the construction of the joint venture trade center.

It was learned that they assured that the Soviet government would guarantee the payment of the commercial loan, however, the exact amount was not known.

It is the first time that the Soviet Union has officially asked a Korean business concern to set up joint ventures with commercial loans.

The sources said that the three visiting Soviet officials also asked Ssangyong to provide technology for the construction of the trade center.

In the meantime, Ssangyong Chairman Kim showed a positive response to the Soviet proposal.

He told the three Soviet officials that Ssangyong would soon dispatch a working-level team to Moscow to study the project jointly with the Soviet Union.

The trade center project reportedly includes the construction of a tourist hotel, a shopping center, and commercial and trade offices on a tract of 10,000 pyong (one pyong is equivalent to 3.3 square meters).

In the meeting with the three Soviet officials, Kim also requested for the participation of Ssangyong in Siberian development projects and other Soviet construction projects.

The Ssangyong chairman invited them in exchange for their invitation to the Soviet Union last November. [sentence as published]

Near East & South Asia

Shevardnadze, Afghan Ambassador Discuss Relations

LD3001172289 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1656 GMT 30 Jan 89

[Text] Moscow, 30 Jan (TASS)—USSR Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze today received Sayyed Muhammad Gulabzoy, Ambassador of the Republic of Afghanistan to the USSR, at the latter's request.

During the conversation there was a thorough exchange of views on a whole range of questions on Soviet-Afghan relations and further cooperation in various areas, in the context of the forthcoming conclusion of the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Afghanistan and cooperation between our countries in the subsequent stage.

During discussion of the joint actions of the Soviet Union and Afghanistan toward ensuring an urgent and universal Afghan settlement, the sides confirmed their countries' commitment to fulfilling obligations in accordance with the Geneva agreements, calling for the continuation of the search for ways to nationwide peace in the country through constructive dialogue and mutual compromises from the whole spectrum of Afghanistan's political forces, in the interests of the Afghan people and of a neutral and demilitarized Afghanistan.

It was also stressed that attempts to force a military solution to Afghanistan's internal problems on the Afghan people, or to break the latter's political will for peace or for the creation of a government coalition on a broad and pluralist basis, by means of an economic blockade, are futile.

The conversation passed in a warm and friendly atmosphere.

Afghan Opposition 'Rejects Compromise'

PM3101110289 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 31 Jan 89 Morning Edition p 4

[Feature prepared by Yevg. Bay in Moscow, N. Paklin in Delhi: "Afghanistan: The Opposition Rejects Compromise"]

[Text] The Afghan Foreign Ministry has assessed the decision of a number of Western states to evacuate the personnel of their diplomatic missions from Kabul as a new stage in the escalation of the propaganda warfare against Afghanistan. A statement issued by a Foreign Ministry spokesman notes that the claims that there is a danger to foreign embassies after the withdrawal of the Soviet troops have no foundation.

IZVESTIYA has already reported that on Thursday of last week the American diplomats left the Afghan capital. In the wake of the United States, Britain, France, and Japan decided to close their embassies.

West European and U.S. mass information organs are continuing to make gloomy predictions. "Fear hangs over Kabul," the France-5 television channel claims in a reportage from the Afghan capital. "There are fears that after the departure of the Soviet troops carnage of unprecedented cruelty will begin here," Antenne-2 reports.

"As Britain prepares to close its embassy in Kabul, Afghan workers are fixing barbed wire to the British Embassy fence," a correspondent for America's CBS television reports. "Many people in Kabul feel uncertain about tomorrow. Even the Iranian Embassy has taken the trouble to attach sheets of metal to the gates. While the withdrawal of Soviet troops is in progress, people here are not so much afraid of attacks by armed rebels as of serious street riots."

Leading mass information organs admit, however, that the situation in the Afghan capital depends largely on the Kabul-Tashkent airlift. "The food situation in Kabul has improved slightly since the Russians dropped food to the Afghan capital by air," the CBS correspondent notes.

What position is held by the United States, which acted as a guarantor country in the signing of the Geneva agreements?

"In conditions of growing chaos and the increasingly acute problem of ensuring security in Afghanistan, President G. Bush stated that the United States will try to promote the stabilization of the situation in the country after the completion of the Soviet troops' withdrawal," THE NEW YORK TIMES writes on its front page. "At the same time the President has not deviated from the policy of strict noninterference," the newspaper notes.

However, a number of high-ranking Washington staffers interpret the U.S. "stabilizing" role in their own way. In an interview also in THE NEW YORK TIMES, Richard Murphy, leading State Department expert on Near East problems, stated that "Washington cannot prevent an intensification of opposition attacks on the Kabul government after the end of the Soviet troops' withdrawal. Let us hope that the regime's death throes will be brief," he said.

One feels that conclusions like this are hardly likely to help strengthen stability in Afghanistan.

What is the way out of the crisis? The majority of participants in an international conference held in Delhi on "A Nonaligned Afghanistan, for Peace and Security in the Region" believe that in this situation the UN should have an important say.

"The new democratic government of Pakistan cannot by itself bring sufficient influence to bear on the mujahidin based in Peshawar," Professor V.Yu. Chopra [as transliterated], director of the Indian Center for Regional Studies, says. "The United Nations should help Islamabad here with its authority. India is sincerely interested in Afghanistan's becoming a united, neutral, and nonaligned country with a stable government."

And this is what Said M. Mayvand [as transliterated], one of the Afghan refugee leaders who are in Delhi, told our correspondent behind the scenes at the conference:

"UN troops must be brought into Afghanistan to replace the Soviet troops that are being withdrawn. A jirga should then be set up under UN auspices, representing all strata of the Afghan population and all political groups. It should set up a provisional government. I, like many Afghan refugees, believe that neither the present Najibullah regime nor the mujahidin, who receive money and weapons from abroad, have a monopoly of power."

A week still remains before the start of the visit by USSR Foreign Minister E.A. Shevardnadze to Islamabad, but the foreign press has already begun to discuss actively the consultations to be held in the Pakistani capital with a view to a political settlement of the Afghan problem. While the opposition demands the disbanding of the present Najibullah administration, the USSR advocates that this administration remain in power after the withdrawal of Soviet troops, Japan's MAINICHI notes. In this connection it is expected that in the course of talks with Bhutto and President Ghulam Ishaq Khan, the Soviet minister could put forward some new project.

The armed opposition also hurried to have its say about E.A. Shevardnadze's visit. Rabbani, one of the leaders of the "Alliance of Seven," stated that the mujahidin do not intend to meet with the Soviet minister when he visits Pakistan, and expressed concern that E.A. Shevardnadze could try to force Islamabad to bring pressure to bear on the Afghan refugees to make them return home too quickly and "cause problems" for the opposition.

The nervousness of the alliance leaders arises from the growing differences within the Afghan opposition, which, as Britain's SUNDAY TIMES indicates, are increasing as the ring tightens around Kabul. Here the main struggle is between those who advocate the creation of an Islamic fundamentalist state and those who want to restore the monarchy. The majority of refugees, it is well known, would welcome the return home of former king Zahir Shah, after which they, too, intend to return to Afghanistan.

Seeking to rectify the negative idea that has grown up in the world of the mujahidins as barbarians and marauders who condemn their own compatriots to death by starvation, the leaders of the armed opposition have published a plan whereby they intend to supply 60,000 tonnes of food to the inhabitants of Kabul and Jalalabad, REUTER reports. But at the same time, the BAKHTAR agency reports, members of armed gangs are continuing to shell civilian districts of Kabul and commit crimes on the Kabul-Hayraton road. The office of the president of Afghanistan has issued a report pointing out that over a lengthy period the state authorities made efforts to establish contacts with Afghan resistance leader Ahmad Shah Masud. However, he failed to respond positively to two messages from the president, did not respond to the call for peace, and continued to carry out terrorist activity. In these conditions the government was forced to give the order to the armed forces to free the regions adjacent to the highway in the Salang region from killers and robbers.

Maslyukov Arrives After Yazov for Talks in Kabul

Such Conferences 'Only Natural'

LD3001164689 Moscow World Service in English 1210 GMT 30 Jan 89

[Text] A Soviet delegation headed by First Deputy Prime Minister Yuriy Maslyukov has arrived in Kabul, almost immediately after the working visit of Soviet Defense Minister Dmitriy Yazov. In the course of the talks held during the two visits a wide range of questions was discussed, connected with further promoting Soviet-Afghan cooperation. Here is what Radio Moscow's Aleksandr Pogodin writes:

It is only natural that the two sides discussed the problems in the light of the situation that would develop after the withdrawal of the Soviet troops. A little more than 2 weeks remain till 15th February, the date set by the Geneva Accords for completing the pullout. The Soviet Union will be complying with those accords and, despite all the difficulties, will also be honoring all its obligations as regards Afghanistan, and that, among other things, includes giving assistance in the economic, social and other fields. The Soviet Union has now reaffirmed its readiness to go on helping the Afghan leaders in building up the national economy and raising living standards.

But to do all that it is necessary to have a stable regime in Kabul, and that regime today has all it needs, including up-to-date arms, to bring to reason those who stake on power pressure, on a military victory and on bringing down the government by force. And if the opposition continues hostilities, Soviet military shipment will also continue. While being fully convinced of the stability of the Kabul regime, Afghanistan and the Soviet Union at the same time point out that the continuation of the war cannot bring a solution to the country's domestic problems. It would only cause more sufferings on the part of the people and lead to new heavy casualties. Reality itself prompts the need to form a broad-based coalition government in Afghanistan, a government of peace with the participation of all political forces, parties and groups. The Soviet Union has no intention of substituting for the Afghans and solving their internal affairs for them. But it is ready to go on helping a direct dialogue between the Afghans at the negotiating table and implementing all the Geneva Accords. And most probably those problems will also be discussed when the Soviet foreign minister, Eduard Shevardnadze, visits Pakistan towards the end of the week.

Another Meeting With Najibullah

PM3101111189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 31 Jan 89 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Meetings in Kabul"; see 30 January Soviet Union DAILY REPORT, p 34, for report on initial 29 January meetings]

[Text] Kabul, 30 Jan —This morning the Soviet delegation headed by Yu.D. Maslyukov, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, chairman of the USSR State Planning Committee, had another meeting with Najibullah, president of the Republic of Afghanistan, within the framework of its working visit.

At the meeting a detailed analysis, taking account of the internal political situation in the country, was made of the accords reached during the meetings which had been held, and concrete measures agreed on and specified on providing additional economic aid to Afghanistan.

The Soviet side confirmed its desire and readiness—in keeping with the traditions of Soviet-Afghan relations that have built up, as well as existing obligations—to continue to lend all-around support to the leadership of the Republic of Afghanistan in the cause of achieving peace, and of establishing and developing economic and social structures in the country.

President Najibullah spoke highly of the Soviet Union's diverse aid to the Afghan people—aid which has acquired great significance, particularly at the present time, at a stage when many acute issues which will determine the future of Afghanistan are being tackled.

In the latter half of the day the delegation left Kabul for home.

New Delhi Conference Views Afghan Situation

LD2701235189 Moscow TASS in English 2154 GMT 27 Jan 89

[Text] New Delhi January 28 TASS—The struggle for peace in Asia is inseparable from the movement for world security and disarmament. Settlement of the conflict around Afghanistan should become a major step on the way to that. The situation in Afghanistan however is now giving rise to serious concern.

This was stated by participants in a two-day international conference "Non-Aligned Afghanistan, Peace and Stability in the Region," which opened in the Indian capital on January 27. The representative forum, being held on the initiative of the influential non-governmental organisation the Indian Institute on Non-Alignment Problem Studies, is attended by statesmen and politicians of India, delegations from Afghanistan, Iran, Pakistan, USSR, United States, representatives of the United Nations and the World Peace Council.

Opening the conference, India's Defense Minister Krishna Chandra Pant underlined that there had been a considerable reduction in international tension in the recent time. The signing of the INF Treaty, Soviet-American summit meetings, practical measures towards nuclear disarmament and reduction of conventional armaments promoted an improvement in the political climate in the world. The whole of the international community optimistically expects a further improvement of the situation in the world in the new year as a result of disarmament processes and growing economic cooperation between different states, said India's defense minister. While big powers and their allies are advancing towards cooperation, the uncertain situation around Afghanistan is exerting a negative impact on the world situation and is giving rise to concern.

India cordially welcomed the signing of the Geneva agreements on Afghanistan, said Krishna Chandra Pant. The Soviet Union has fully honoured the obligation for withdrawal of 50 per cent of its troops from the Afghan territory by mid-August last year, and is now ready to complete this process. But tension around Afghanistan and inside that country is not subsiding. Judging by U.S. actions, the United States intends to continue supplying the armed opposition with weapons, and to work for the overthrow of Afghanistan's administration headed by President Najibullah. Some Pakistani circles are trying to prevent a reduction in tension around Afghanistan, notwithstanding Pakistani Prime Minister Benazir Bhutto's support for political settlement of the Afghan conflict.

India favours preservation of the status of Afghanistan's genuine non-alignment, it comes out in support of Afghanistan's independence and sovereignty, the speaker said. In the course of the Soviet-Indian summit meeting in November 1988 the USSR and India called for an international conference to be held to find ways for settlement of the Afghanistan conflict. India intends to continue doing its utmost to have the confrontation in the region ended as soon as possible.

The participants in the conference noted that the United States and Pakistan are undermining the Geneva Accords on Afghanistan, and this is the main obstacle to restoration of durable peace and stability not only in that country but also in the whole region.

President of the World Peace Council Romesh Chandra said that the U.S. imperialist circles and also Pakistan are blocking up processes of settlement in Afghanistan in a bid to prevent termination of the arms race in south and south western Asia, to maintain tension there. Such actions are contrary to the striving of the peoples of the world for peace, with the first major victories having been attained in the struggle for its prevention. An early end to the conflict around Afghanistan, he underlined, will help strengthen universal security, lead to the states final renunciation of the use of force in international affairs, solution of all present-day problems by exclusively peaceful means.

Baker Clarifies Policies on South Asia Relations

BK2801102989 Moscow in Hindi to India 1400 GMT 27 Jan 89

[Oleg Ivanov Commentary]

[Text] Testifying before the Senate, the new U.S. secretary of state, James Baker, clarified the main thrust of the U.S. policy on South Asia. It is obvious that the Bush administration will have to face an entirely new situation in South Asia as compared to that of the last decade. The Afghan crisis is nearing its solution, in which the strict implementation of pledges given by the Soviet Union and Afghanistan under the Geneva accords proved of great help. In Pakistan, the democratically elected government of Benazir Bhutto has assumed office. The interest shown by Pakistan in normalizing its relations with India should also be considered as an expression of the changes taking place in this region. Initial steps in this direction were taken during the talks and meetings held by the leaders of the two countries during the SAARC summit. Overall changes in the region, including concrete political changes in South Asia, have forced the Washington strategists to change policy.

As is known, earlier Washington openly emphasized cooperation with Pakistan, considering it a frontline state. Extensive programs of military cooperation were the firm expressions of this policy. The last such package was worth $4 billion and extended over 6 years. Whatever the real intentions of the Washington leaders, it cannot be denied that their policy only helped in increasing regional tension. To take one example, the U.S. Congressmen took no notice of Pakistan's program to manufacture a nuclear device in order not to draw the wrath of an allied country. This almost led to the introduction of nuclear weapons into this region, which increased suspicion in India-Pakistan relations and prevented the improvement of India-U.S. ties.

Today very few reasons are left to consider Pakistan a frontline state. Given this situation, what did James Baker have to propose? He said these days the leaders of both India and Pakistan are developing more constructive relations and the U.S. plans to pursue its policy on the basis of such relations between them. The U.S. secretary of state spoke of the simultaneous improvement and development of relations with both India and Pakistan. James Baker's intentions appear very constructive and, perhaps, the only feasible option under such circumstances. By pursuing this path Washington could contribute toward strengthening peace and stability in South Asia and thus guarantee security in this region. But the intentions are good only when they followed up with concrete deeds.

Now, let us perceive the changes in the U.S. policy in the Indian subcontinent from this angle. On the one hand, the United States is ready for the balanced development of its relations with South Asian countries. India-U.S. relations witnessed some improvement, especially after Indian Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi's U.S. visit. Favorable conditions are being created for the development of economic, scientific, and technical cooperation. The United States is also trying to solve a few bilateral problems, which in turn influence the U.S. attitude on other issues of great importance. The well-known Congressman Stephen Solarz, who recently visited India, promised that the activities of the extremist groups, above all the Sikhs, on U.S. soil will be stopped. The hint given by the U.S. Administration to the new Pakistani leadership is also of no less significance. A few days before the Pakistani elections, Mr (Peter Galbraith) a political scientist close to the U.S. Administration, and who keeps close personal contacts with Benazir Bhutto, recommended that she improve relations with India.

On the other hand, even while assuming a few constructive changes, it still could not be said that there have been basic changes in U.S. priorities. As is known, Pakistan became a strategic ally of the United States not only because it is a party to the Afghan controversy or because of its tense relations with India, but mainly because of those plans which link Pakistan to the U.S. strategy in the Indian Ocean. According to reports, Pakistan should assume the role once played by the Shah of Iran and become the main base for the U.S. strategy. Here one should recall the activities of the Pentagon, which is trying to establish a series of bases along the Makran coast [in Baluchistan]. Keeping this in mind, some quarters in the U.S. Congress and Administration consider it appropriate to continue liberal assistance to Pakistan in the future. Many more F-16 aircraft could be sold to the Pakistan Armed Forces in the near future. If this policy gains the upper hand, the flow of sophisticated arms to Pakistan will further increase—and this is the main reason for tension between India and Pakistan in this region. But even if this does not happen, the question of the balanced development of U.S.-Indian and U.S.-Pakistan relations also does not arise, at least at present, and this may continue to be an important reason for the tension.

Pakistan's Bhutto First Official Visit to PRC

OW2701201089 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1150 GMT 23 Jan 89

[From the "World Today" program, presented by Igor Goranskiy]

[Text] The first official visit of Benazir Bhutto, Pakistan prime minister, will be made to China. A spokesman for the Pakistan Ministry of Foreign Affairs stated at a press briefing that it would be made in the middle of next February. Local political observers think that Benazir Bhutto's intention to start her foreign visits precisely with China attests to her aspirations to further strengthen Pakistan's relations with this country.

Since diplomatic relations between the two countries were established in 1951, the PRC has always been one of the traditional and closest partners of Pakistan. In recent years, Pakistan-PRC relations were characterized by an intensification of cooperation in the political, economic, scientific, technical, cultural, and military spheres. The development of comprehensive relations with China, as Benazir Bhutto herself said, will continue to have priority in the foreign policy of the Government of the Pakistan People's Party, which has recently come to power.

Foreign Affairs Official on Mideast Policy

PM2701155289 London AL-HAWADITH in Arabic 27 Jan 89 pp 29-30

[Interview with "Soviet Foreign Affairs Minister" Yuriy Vinogradov by unidentified correspondent in Cairo; date not given]

[Text] AL-HAWADITH: There is fear in some Arab capitals that a change may occur in the Soviet Union's traditional position on the Middle East, whether by abandoning the idea of the Palestinians' right to self-determination or by restoring Moscow-Tel Aviv relations.

Vinogradov: First, it is much too early to talk about the restoration of relations between the Soviet Union and Israel at the diplomatic level. Second, the Soviet Union does not change its friends, nor does it abandon its basic principles. The source of our relations with the Arab peoples—and the Palestinian people in particular—is our support for their right to defend their independence and recover their usurped land. Any change in our position on or view of the Arab peoples must be preceded by a change in the Soviet Union as a superpower which has its own principles and strategy, as well as its own economic, social, and political orientations. This, of course, could not possibly happen. So I believe that any Arab fears about the Soviet position are unfounded.

AL-HAWADITH: But there is a permanent Soviet consular mission in Israel.

Vinogradov: Yes. This is ture. But at the same time I can say that there is an Israeli Embassy in Cairo. Has that changed Cairo's position on the Palestinian problem or Egypt's Arab relations, which have flourished and developed recently?

AL-HAWADITH: Some people noted a flirtation between Moscow and Tel Aviv following the incident involving the hijacked Soviet aircraft which landed in Tel Aviv—a crisis Israel helped to resolve.

Vinogradov: Israel's attitude during that crisis was rational and proved that Israel has not lost all its mental faculties. Its rational attitude was governed by human logic, which perhaps does not apply to the Israelis' dealings with the Palestinians. That incident has not affected our position toward the Arabs and the Palestinian problem.

AL-HAWADITH: Do you believe that there is now a good opportunity for a solution to the Palestinian problem, especially in view of Palestinian realism and flexibility despite Israeli intransigence?

Vinogradov: There is a German proverb that says: A drop of water can penetrate a rock. There are difficult and complex crises. Some crises can be resolved easily and quickly. But the Palestinian problem remains the most complex of crises: this because there is an Israel backed by the United States. The recent PNC decisions are undoubtedly historic and new. They will help push the settlement and solution process forward. The decisions disprove and refute any Israeli claims that the Palestinians are advocates of war and terrorism and do not seek peace. The Palestinian leadership's political decisions and stances, together with the continuation of the uprising, are shaking the ranks of Israeli society, not artificially, but genuinely, thus helping Israeli public opinion unmask the truth about the Palestinian position, which will have influence on Israel's rulers and leaders.

But the question being raised revolves around the effect of these changes and developments on the Israeli Government's position. Only the days ahead will provide the answer to this question.

AL-HAWADITH: So you are among those who believe in the possibility of convening an international conference this year?

Vinogradov: With regard to determining a date for convening the international conference, I do not believe that setting a date can be correct or definite. But in principle there is optimism and confidence about convening an international conference, especially since the world as a whole, except one-and-a-half states, has agreed that it is the only way to resolve the Palestinian problem.

AL-HAWADITH: What do you mean by one-and-a-half states?

Vinogradov: I mean Israel and half the United States. This is because on the one hand, the United States supports the convening of an international conference, but on the other it is still searching for a formal framework and role for that conference. This means that its support is incomplete or unclear.

AL-HAWADITH: How do you view the course of Soviet-Egyptian relations, bearing in mind that you were Moscow's ambassador to Cairo in 1973?

Vinogradov: We are pleased that Egyptian-Soviet relations are now proceeding normally. In fact they have developed in all fields and directions, that is, in terms of economic, trade, and scientific relations, and well as relations between the two peoples, public opinion leaders, and political leaders. I believe that the visit to Moscow by Egyptian Deputy Prime Minister and Foreign Minister Dr 'Ismat 'Abd al-Majid and his meeting with Soviet leaders, especially Mr Gorbachev, has had a great impact on the progress and development of these relations. A few days ago the extensive talks between the two countries' trade and economic ministries ended with the conclusion of a new agreement which will impart an impetus to work in this field. There is no longer any room for a dispute between the Soviet Union and Egypt. We are discussing with the Egyptian side ways of utilizing and exploiting that atmosphere in developing relations between the two countries in further fields.

AL-HAWADITH: So we come to the Gulf war. Do you not believe that the Soviet position on that war was unclear? It backed Iraq at one point and supported Iran at another point.

Vinogradov: This is a good question because I worked for 5 years as my country's ambassador to Tehran. I was there when the war started. I completed my mission in 1982. We did not support aggression from either side. Actually when the war fist started we told both Iran and Iraq: This war is not against imperialism, nor is it a nationalistic war. It is fratricidal.

That is why we worked to end it as quickly as possible, especially since it was based on no logic or reason. It resulted in many dangers. Right from the start we warned that the war would bring to the region foreign military forces hostile to both Iran and Iraq, but they did not heed our views. As a result, foreign forces entered the Gulf. But eventually this was one of the factors that helped the two sides end the war. Our advice helped, but only after a very long delay. Be that as it may, we did not back any party in that war.

AL-HAWADITH: This prompts me to ask: Through your work as Soviet ambassador to Iran and your understanding of the Iranian mentality, do you believe that Iran really intends to proceed toward peace following the announcement of its agreement to implement Resolution 598 and the faltering of negotiations with Iraq?

Vinogradov: Let me tell you that it is Iraq, not Iran, which is at this stage relatively obstructing the signing of a peace agreement.

AL-HAWADITH: How can you tell that Iraq is the one obstructing a solution to the Gulf war?

Vinogradov: Iraq demands that the 1975 Algiers agreement on Shatt al-'Arab be considered invalid. What does this position mean? It is sufficient to make Iran refuse to continue the negotiations. True, there are other problems such as POW's and compensations, but the Shatt al-'Arab issue and the 1970 [as published] agreement are the major obstacles to the attainment of a breakthrough toward a solution of the problem.

AL-HAWADITH: There is an issue being discussed in both Moscow and Washington, namely what conditions take shape in Iran after Khomeyni. How do you envisage Iran during that period?

Vinogradov: This is like a guessing game. All the possibilities suggested are not based on facts because it is difficult to forecast such things. Iran is a neighboring state of the Soviet Union and shares a 2,500 km border with us. The pattern of Iran's evolution is exceptional and unique, and there are no similar experiments with which to compare it. We do not judge what is positive and what is negative in that experiment. It is an internal issue which does not concern us. All that concerns us is that Iranian-Soviet relations are witnessing a stage of growth and development, and we are happy about that.

AL-HAWADITH: Especially after Khomeyni's letter to Gorbachev?

Vinogradov. Yes.

AL-HAWADITH: Do you believe Soviet-Iranian rapprochement is taking place at Iraq's expense?

Vinogradov: This is absolutely untrue. The Iraqi state is a friend of ours, and we are happy about our good relations with any Arab state. When our relations with Egypt were not ideal, we always expressed complete readiness for any rapprochement or development of them.

AL-HAWADITH: So we come to the Afghan problem. There are real fears of the Soviet Union's abandoning its intention of withdrawing from Afghanistan. What truth is there in this?

Vinogradov: There is a Soviet commitment to complete the withdrawal by the date set. But Pakistan and the United States are not fulfilling their obligations and commitments. We are now trying to encourage the two countries to fulfill these commitments.

AL-HAWADITH: What obligations and commitments have they not fulfilled?

Vinogradov: Obligations such as noninterference in Afghanistan's internal affairs; not supplying opponents with arms, equipment, and money—since they would be used against the present government—as well as helping establish a policy of national reconciliation and the formation of an Afghan coalition government.

AL-HAWADITH: What is the deadline for the withdrawal of all Soviet forces from Afghanistan?

Vinogradov: According to the agreement concluded, the deadline for the withdrawal is mid-February.

AL-HAWADITH: Is it possible for us to know the results of Yuliy Vorontsov's shuttle visits to the surrounding states concerning the Afghan problem?

Vinogradov: Vorontsov's mission is both difficult and sensitive. But it is very beneficial. Matters are not so easy, and the Afghan opposition, backed by its supporters, is intransigent and refuses to adapt to present conditions.

AL-HAWADITH: There has been talk and reports of a tour of the Middle East region by Foreign Minister Eduard Sheverdnadze. Has a date been set for that tour?

Vinogradov: Sheverdnadze will undoutedbly visit the Middle East region. As for the date, it has not yet been set.

AL-HAWADITH: Do you believe the United States is now ready to respond to the changes being made by leader Gorbachev?

Vinogradov: We hope so. because if there are any realistic and objective politicians, they must accept the Soviet political proposals and ideas. We must wait. They need more time to absorb the new Soviet thinking and policy.

AL-HAWADITH: To what extent has the atmosphere of detente played a role in resolving regional problems and conflicts?

Vinogradov: The new climate has undoubtedly contributed to the process of finding solutions to regional problems. Had it not been for this international climate and detente between the United States and the Soviet Union, it would have been impossible to proceed toward finding solutions to regional crises.

AL-HAWADITH: What about Gorbachev's initiative to settle Third World debts, which have become an obstacle to those states' economic development?

Vinogradov: In my opinion, Gorbachev's proposals for resolving the Third World debt problem has encountered a response and understanding from all developing states, especially since the proposals are both constructive and realistic. No other party has presented an alternative for alleviating the Third World's economic conditions and problems.

DPLP's Secretary Hawatimah Holds Moscow Talks

No Soviet-Israeli Ties

LD2801171989 Kuwait KUNA in English 1618 GMT 28 Jan 89

[By Adib al-Sayyed]

[Text] Moscow, Jan 28 (KUNA)—A Palestinian official has affirmed that U.S., Israeli and Soviet-Jews pressures will not persuade Moscow to resume diplomatic ties with Israel before the commencement of the international conference on the Mideast.

The secretary general of the Popular [as received] Front for the Liberation of Palestine Nayif Hawatimah said, in an interview with KUNA here today, that Israel is trying to take advantage of the new Soviet perestroyka policy by infiltrating through Soviet intellectuals and media men.

Hawatimah said the Soviets have their intensive plans for diplomatic activities in the region, noting that Foreign Minister Edward Shevardnadze will soon pay a visit to the Middle East.

He lashed out at any new involvement in the Mideast question by former Secretary of State Henry Kissinger whose moves will only be "suspicious' and careless about regional issues.

The Soviets, he added, expect that a preparatory commission on the international conference will meet during the current year, stressing that Moscow rejects direct, bilateral Israeli-Palestinian talks and opposes a mere "umbrella" international conference.

During his visit here, Hawatimah met with a number of Soviet officials and intellectuals concerned with Arab issues.

Arabic Paper Interviews Hawatimah

JN3101104589 Abu Dhabi AL-ITTIHAD in Arabic 29 Jan 89 p 7

[Text] Moscow—AL-ITTIHAD—The DFLP secretary general has concluded the final round of talks with the Soviet officials. The talks resulted in an agreement to be announced later concerning the establishment of a Soviet-Palestinian committee to follow up the Middle East situation and the Palestine question.

In an interview with AL-ITTIHAD prior to departing the Soviet capital, where he arrived 2 days earlier at an official Soviet invitation, Nayif Hawatimah said the talks he held with the Soviet Foreign Ministry and the CPSU Central committee were very successful. He affirmed that the Soviets are trying to expedite the resolution of the Middle East issue with all its aspects, including the convocation of an international conference. He said the Soviets are holding intensive contacts with U.S. President George Bush on this issue; however, he said, this needs time because of Reagan's departure and Bush's arrival.

He said the Soviets affirmed to him that their policy did not and will not change, and there will be no diplomatic relations with Israel before it recognizes a Palestinian state on the ground and returns all occupied Arab territories to their lawful owners.

On the issue of declaring a Palestinian government, Hawatimah said intensive dialogue is being held to form a government and announce it officially. He added, however, that some obstructions face the declaration of a government. He said: Some say we should not declare a government before the convocation of an international conference. Others are trying to include in the Palestinian government Palestinian personalities other than those agreed upon in accordance with the Algiers [PNC] resolutions. He said this means an attempt to exclude major Palestinian factions which participated in the dialogue. These are the DFLP, the PFLP, the Communist Party, and sincere Palestinian personalities from the occupied territories.

Hawatimah revealed that talks are being held between the PLO and the current U.S. Administration through Swedish mediators. He said these talks have been fruitless, as the U.S. position is still the same: No to an independent Palestinian state and yes to a confederation with Jordan, Israel, Syria, or Egypt. He said: This will prolong the duration of talks on the convocation of an international conference; we do not know whether one will be convened or not, nor when. He asserted that Israel and the United States are trying by all means possible to strangle the glorious uprising, which played a major role in the proclamation of the Palestinian state. He said the uprising will continue until independence and the proclamation of the Palestinian state on the ground, with Jerusalem as its capital. He said that this is supported by the Soviet Union in word and deed.

East Europe

Further on Zaykov, Delegation Visit to Belgrade

25-Member Delegation Arrives

AU2501171289 Belgrade Domestic Service in Serbo-Croatian 1400 GMT 25 Jan 89

[Text] A 25-member delegation of the Moscow City Communist Party Committee delegation arrived in Belgrade this morning. The delegation is led by Lev Zaykov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first secretary of the Moscow Gorkom.

In talks that have just concluded in the Belgrade City LC Committee, the host, Rados Smiljkovic, president of the City Committee, informed the guests about the adoption of the amendments to the SFRY Constitution, the constitutional changes in Serbia, the processes of democratization in the country, the vision of the LCY role, and political pluralism.

Lev Zaykov informed the host about the course of political life and restructuring. Zaykov also spoke about the role of the CPSU which, in his words, has the leading role and should retain it.

The members of the Moscow Gorkom will stay in Belgrade until 28 January.

Zaykov Conveys Gorbachev Greetings

LD2701125289 Belgrade TANJUG Domestic Service in Serbo-Croatian 1139 GMT 27 Jan 89

[Text] Belgrade, 27 Jan (TANJUG)—Stefan Korosec, secretary of the LCY Central Committee Presidium, today received Lev Zaykov, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and first secretary of the Moscow Gorkom, who is in Yugoslavia in the framework of cooperation between the Belgrade and Moscow City Committees.

Lev Zaykov conveyed to the LCY Central Committee Presidium and to its president, Stipe Suvar, cordial greetings from the leadership of the CPSU and its general secretary, Mikhail Gorbachev.

In cordial talks there was a positive assessment on both sides concerning the cooperation between the LCY and the CPSU as well as overall Yugoslav-Soviet relations and it was noted that cooperation at republican, provincial, and city level makes a great contribution to their development. In this context emphasis was placed on the cooperation between Belgrade and Moscow and their party organizations.

Lev Zaykov informed Korosec of the activity of the CPSU in implementing the decisions of the 19th party conference and especially the changes in the political system of the USSR and the position and role of the party, stressing that there is no alternative to restructuring.

Stefan Korosec spoke about the situation in Yugoslavia, the efforts of the LC to stabilize conditions, as well as about the consistent implementation of the three reforms. He stressed, in particular, that these decisions of the first conference of the LCY have met with the popular support of the working class and all the nations and nationalities of Yugoslavia and that their implementation is the sure way to overcome the economic and political difficulties.

Zaykov Addresses Belgrade Communists

PM3101092589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 28 Jan 89 Second Edition pp 4-5

[TASS report: "Cooperation: New Approaches"]

[Text] Belgrade, 27 Jan—Yugoslav Communists are following with tremendous attention the progress of the revolutionary transformations under way in the USSR on the CPSU's initiative. Today the Russian word "perestroyka" is on the lips of everyone who sincerely wants socialism to rise in a dynamic and ongoing way to a qualitatively new level and reveal its tremendous creative potential more fully.

L.N. Zaykov, member of the Politburo, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and first secretary of Moscow party gorkom, who is on a working visit to the SFRY, described to his Yugoslav comrades how the restructuring processes are gathering momentum, and spoke of the tasks which the party has to resolve at this crucial juncture. He was meeting with the party aktiv of the Belgrade City Committee of the League of Communists.

The essence of restructuring itself, L.N. Zaykov emphasized, consists at the present stage in implementing what has been conceived and translating the principled decisions of recent years into practical deeds. The end result is the chief criterion for assessing Communists' activity.

Today the USSR is faced with large-scale tasks of political and socioeconomic development. Soviet people, L.N. Zaykov went on to say, are fully resolved to radically improve socialist society and bring it up to a qualitatively new level. We have been brought to a realization of the need for restructuring, he pointed out, above all by the desire to resolve the most urgent problems created by the stagnation of the previous period.

The practical actions of party and state organs were lagging behind the demands of the times and behind life itself. The discrepancy between word and deed was increasing. Negative processes were growing in the economy, creating an essentially precrisis situation. Anomalous phenomena in the social, spiritual, and moral spheres were distorting and deforming the principles of social justice and giving rise to social alienation within society.

Profoundly aware of the situation which had taken shape in the country, at the CPSU Central Committee April (1985) Plenum the party took a revolutionary initiative and advanced an innovative program for the renewal of Soviet society on the principles of socialism. Thus the great restructuring began. It underwent theoretical and political development in the decisions of the 27th congress, the subsequent CPSU Central Committee plenums, and the 19th all-union party conference.

That essentially historic conference made a very important contribution to restructuring. Held in a new moral and political atmosphere, in the spirit of realism, it enriched the party with new experience of political schooling for the whole people, schooling in glasnost and democracy. The discussion which developed at the conference on the chief issues of our life helped the search for truth and the in-depth elaboration and adoption of urgent decisions.

The conference demonstrated once again our party's mighty potential, and confirmed that the CPSU is truly the driving force behind restructuring, its initiator and acknowledged leader reflecting the fundamental interests of the people and socialism. This, the CPSU Central Committee secretary emphasized, was the chief political result of the party conference.

Through restructuring, he said, we are seeking to restore socialism's Leninist aspect and to rid ourselves of everything that was fettering society and preventing the full realization of the new system's potential. The process of its revolutionary renewal will take effort, time, and responsibility. It has its own logic and stages. Precisely the most complex stage has now arrived. Figuratively speaking, we have entered the boost stage of the trajectory of restructuring, when the tasks of the practical implementation of the formulated policy and the adopted decisions have arisen in all their magnitude.

The reform of the political system and the all-around democratization of Soviet society have come to the fore.

The profound essence and nucleus of this reform consist in placing the working person at the center of the whole political process and establishing him in the position of master both in production and in the state. A decisive shift will thereby be made away from the domination of the administrative system of management toward the people's omnipotence and the restoration of the principle of democratic centralism in its Leninist interpretation—as the basis of the country's entire political life.

And it is perfectly logical that the restructuring of the political system began with the CPSU itself. We began, L.N. Zaykov said, by defining more clearly the party's place in society as the political vanguard, by enhancing responsibility and self-purification, and by calling Communists more rigidly to account for observance of the principles of party-mindedness and morality.

It is from just this viewpoint that all party life is being restructured, the role of elected organs enhanced, and the structure of the apparatus and its work methods improved, starting with raykoms and ending with the CPSU Central Committee.

In the election campaign which is under way in the country to elect the USSR people's deputies, the party has to pass very major tests of its political platform and influence. The CPSU Central Committee regards the upcoming elections as a serious test of the party's authority among the masses, of the effectiveness of the measures being taken to restructure consciousness, and of their impact on various sectors of the country's vital activity.

The party is approaching the elections with a clear-cut, comprehensive, and all-around sensible program for the renewal of society, with high awareness of its responsibility to the Soviet people, with understanding of its role as the acknowledged vanguard of society, with recognition of its responsibility for past mistakes and errors.

The enhancement of people's well-being and the improvement of their life are the main area, core, and aim of all socioeconomic policy.

Realism and innovativeness now distinguish the CPSU's foreign policy as well, L.N. Zaykov said. The new thinking has helped to find approaches to a whole series of problems of international life and to ensure that the world as a whole becomes more secure and that the "cold war" stereotypes are surmounted. Seeing this for ourselves over and over again, he continued, we can be confident that the aim of our foreign policy has been and will be to ensure peaceful living conditions for the generations of Soviet people.

Breakthroughs of a profound, qualitative nature have occurred in our state's foreign policy. The new political thinking formulated by the party embodies the rejection of dogmatism, a sober and objective analysis of the international situation, and orientation toward the general human priority. The implementation of this course has resulted in a lowering of tension and confrontation, and the threat of war being unleashed has receded.

Addressing the United Nations last December, M.S. Gorbachev set forth our view of mankind on the eve of the 21st century and a program of philosophical interpretation of the world and of specific actions in the name of your civilization and ours. This program has been greeted positively throughout the world and received a high assessment in socialist Yugoslavia.

What was heard from the General Assembly rostrum was not only a forecast of the earth's future but also our desire, our appeal to build this future jointly with other peoples. We see the world as a single whole in which common human values and the profound democratization of the whole system of international relations are the determining criteria of progress.

In the arms sphere we proclaim a shift away from the principle of overarmament to the principle of reasonable sufficiency for defense. And in the long term we see a world without nuclear, chemical, or other kinds of mass destruction weapons, and with constantly diminishing arsenals of conventional arms and armed forces. It is certainly not nuclear or military deterrence that can provide a reliable guarantee of security, but political-legal restraint by means of international mechanisms.

Of course, comrades, we realize that we have a difficult, thorny path to travel between our vision of the world of the future and its realization. But the ultimate goal of this path is worth great effort, and we can only travel it together. Our country proposes accelerating this movement right now, this year.

The process of nuclear disarmament begun by the Soviet-U.S. treaty on intermediate-range and shorter-range missiles must be continued without artificial delays.

Being here, in Belgrade, I cannot omit to speak of European affairs too. We are cooperating successfully in the matter of building the "common European home," and our delegations have worked well at the conference which has just ended in Vienna. Neutral and nonaligned countries, including Yugoslavia, played a constructive role in finding compromise solutions. Stability and cooperation in the Mediterranean region are an important constituent of security in Europe. We support the energetic activities of the region's nonaligned states in favor of reducing tension here. As you will recall, it was in Belgrade last March that M.S. Gorbachev put forward a number of proposals which, together with other states' proposals, make it possible to reach accords enabling the positive processes under way in Europe to extend to the Mediterranean.

We cannot speak of a unified world as long as hotbeds of armed conflict persist in a number of regions of the globe, huge material means are thoughtlessly expended, and blood is being shed. True, it has to be pointed out that a breakthrough has recently been achieved in the approach to explosively dangerous situations, and significant progress has been made in settling regional conflicts. The situation is changing for the better practically everywhere. The continuing Soviet troop withdrawal from Afghanistan convincingly attests that we not only realize our responsibility in the matter of settling hotbeds of conflict but also act responsibly with regard to the world community and strictly fulfill our adopted treaty pledges. I cannot fail to note the exceptionally important role of the United Nations in regional problems. The Nonaligned Movement, in which a prominent place belongs to socialist Yugoslavia, can also do a great deal here.

Moscow and Belgrade have many problems in common. And we have great potential for resolving them together, the CPSU Central Committee secretary pointed out. In the chronicle of relations between our countries there are many fine pages of friendship and mutual assistance. The Russian soldier and volunteer repeatedly came to the assistance of Yugoslavs struggling for their freedom. Thousands of Yugoslav internationalists defended October's great cause shoulder to shoulder with Russia's revolutionary workers and peasants. And during the years of World War II the bold actions of Yugoslav servicemen and partisans led by the Communists headed by J. Broz Tito merged in a single, antifascist current of liberation with the heroic struggle of Soviet Army servicemen struggling to save the world from the Nazi plague.

Unfortunately, Soviet-Yugoslav relations have not always been cloudless. But the CPSU and the LCY have found courage and a sense of responsibility for the common cause of socialism in order to overcome alienation between the USSR and the SFRY and restore good relations.

The Communists and working people of Moscow and Belgrade are making their contribution to the development of all-around cooperation between our parties, countries, and peoples. The city party, trade union, and youth organizations and organs of people's power in both capitals maintain permanent contacts. Cooperation is developing fruitfully in the sphere of science and technology, furthered by the establishment of ties between enterprises, scientific research institutes, and educational institutions in Moscow and Belgrade.

New opportunities for a substantive, mutually enriching dialogue and cooperation are being opened up at the present stage in the socialist countries' life, when a serious interpretation is being made of the points reached and the development prospects.

The socialist society requires profound qualitative renewal and increased dynamism. And we have something to think about and to exchange opinions on. Soviet-Yugoslav cooperation must be raised to higher levels and be lent a more planned nature following the example of CPSU-LCY ties, which are realized on the basis of 2-year programs. We value highly the close internationalist ties with the LCY and the SFRY communists' support for our revolutionary restructuring.

The CPSU Central Committee secretary briefed the party aktiv of the Belgrade League of Communists City Committee in detail on the results of the 27th Moscow City CPSU Conference, which ended recently, and on M.S. Gorbachev's speech to the delegates.

The role of the Moscow city party organization—one of the party's largest and most authoritative—in the fate of restructuring is particularly crucial. Its significance is determined by the strong intellectual, scientific, and industrial potential concentrated in the capital and by the scale of the tasks of economic and social development being resolved by Muscovites.

The attention which the Central Committee and the whole country give to Moscow as our motherland's political center and to the way things are going there obliges Moscow's Communists to evaluate the results of their work still more critically, to be bold in exposing existing problems and shortcomings, and to persistently seek out and commission the considerable reserves and potential which they possess. And the heightened sense of dissatisfaction with what has been achieved, which the Moscow city party organization feels today, is perfectly natural. This was discussed at the conference, the CPSU Central Committee secretary said.

Talks were held at the LCY Central Committee between L.N. Zaykov, member of the Politburo, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and first secretary of Moscow CPSU Gorkom, who is on a visit to the SFRY, and S. Korosec, secretary of the LCY Central Committee Presidium.

S. Korosec briefed him on the activities of the Communists, the working class, and all working people of Yugoslavia in implementing the decisions of the 13th LCY Congress and the 1st LCY Conference, and on the efforts aimed at stabilizing the situation in the country by way of the consistent realization of three reforms—of the economic and political systems and also of the LCY. He expressed confidence that the resolute support for the LCY's position on the part of the peoples and ethnic groups of the SFRY is a guarantee of surmounting the economic and political difficulties which the country is experiencing.

After wishing Yugoslav Communists success in resolving the set tasks, L.N. Zaykov dwelt on key issues of the CPSU's political, organizational, ideological, and theoretical work in the course of the revolutionary restructuring of Soviet society. He spoke about the implementation of the 19th all-union party conference decisions. It was emphasized that the CPSU is the initiator of renewal in Soviet society's life and the driving force and guarantor of the socialist renewal processes under way in the country.

S. Korosec and L.N. Zaykov evaluated positively the state of and the prospects for Soviet-Yugoslav relations, an important constituent part of which are interparty ties. Mutual interest was expressed in their further broadening and deepening and in their enrichment with new forms in the spirit of the Soviet-Yugoslav declaration adopted on the results of M.S. Gorbachev's official friendly visit to the SFRY in March 1988.

On the same day L.N. Zaykov had a meeting with S. Milosevic, member of the LCY Central Committee Presidium and president of the League of Communists of Serbia Central Committee Presidium.

S. Milosevic spoke of the republic's socioeconomic development and the republic party organization's activity in resolving tasks in the spheres of the economy, politics, culture, and LCY reorganization.

L.N. Zaykov briefed him on the realization of the CPSU policy of restructuring and renewing sociopolitical and economic life in the USSR. Communists in the Soviet capital take an active part in this work on a tremendous scale.

Both sides emphasized the need for more active and purposeful efforts to broaden and deepen friendly ties between the RSFSR and Serbia and between the party organizations of Moscow and Belgrade—as an important constituent of the multifaceted Soviet-Yugoslav relations.

V.P. Loginov, USSR ambassador to the SFRY, accompanied L.N. Zaykov at the talks.

S. Milosevic gave a dinner in L.N. Zaykov's honor, which was held in a fraternal, comradely atmosphere. L.N. Zaykov and S. Milosevic exchanged speeches.

Trade Imbalance Discussed

LD2801051089 Belgrade TANJUG Domestic Service in Serbo-Croatian 2001 GMT 27 Jan 89

[Text] Belgrade, 27 Jan (TANJUG)—Dr Rados Smiljkovic, president of the Belgrade LC City Committee, had concluding talks tonight with Lev Zaykov, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and first secretary of Moscow Gorkom, who is leading a Moscow party delegation on a friendly 3-day visit to our capital.

The exchange of experience and information on the latest political events in the two countries and capitals was continued in an open and friendly atmosphere. It was noted that these meetings and this kind of exchange of views help to improve understanding and relations and cooperation between our parties and peoples. During the talks, concrete forms were agreed upon regarding the expansion and improvement of party relations. Special programs of measures to promote economic, cultural, scientific, and technical cooperation were discussed as well. During the talks on rich economic cooperation with Belgrade and the SR of Serbia, which provide 41 percent of Yugoslav exports to the Soviet Union, the question of our surplus was brought up, as were the possibilities of solving this problem. It was particularly stressed that the question of imbalance can be resolved by developing new forms of activities, not reducing cooperation. Both sides pointed out that the businessmen of the two cities must take advantage of the good political relations and, disregarding the present economic difficulties, develop and expand economic cooperation raising it to a higher technological level.

Belgrade, where considerable scientific potential is concentrated, is interested in cooperation in the areas of aircraft industry, computers, pharmaceuticals, chemical industry, food technology, and tourism. The need to establish links between the economic planning organs of the two cities was also pointed out so that their firms can be included in development programs on time. Dr Rados Smiljkovic especially stressed the need to tackle technology development for the next century to improve economic cooperation. This proposal was well received by the Moscow party leader who offered either the exchange or sale of the most advanced Soviet technology. It was also agreed that the planned structure of economic exchange will be discussed again so as to make an impact on reducing the Soviet deficit.

With the aim of continuing and expanding cooperation, Lev Zaykov invited the Belgrade party leadership to visit Moscow, an invitation which was accepted with pleasure. The Moscow party delegation is leaving for Dubrovnik tomorrow where they will see cultural and historic sights.

Zaykov Ends Visit, Departs

LD2901223889 Belgrade TANJUG Domestic Service in Serbo-Croatian 1457 GMT 29 Jan 89

[Text] Dubrovnik, 29 Jan (TANJUG)—A CPSU delegation that has been staying in our country within the framework of the cooperation program between the party organizations of Moscow and Belgrade left Dubrovnik for the USSR today. Immediatley before leaving, the delegation members, led by Lev Zaykov, member of the Politburo, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and secretary of the Moscow Gorkom, were bade farewell by Boris Malada, a member of the Croatian LC Central Committee and chairman of the Commission for International Relations of the Croatian LC Central Committee; Borislav Kuzmanovic, secretary of the Belgrade City Committee of the Serbian LC; and by

Zelimir Uskokovic and Ivo Capalj, president and secretary respectively of the Dubrovnik Municipal Committee of the Croatian LC. Vadim Loginov, the USSR Ambassador to Yugoslavia, also saw them off.

During their 2-day stay in Dubrovnik, the members of the CPSU delegation saw the cultural and historic sights in the old city, and also visited the Dubrava Hotel and tourist center, and the Institute for the Reconstruction of Dubrovnik, the Dubrovnik summer festival. Just before leaving our country they also saw Cavtat.

Results of Zaykov Talks Reviewed

PM3001120589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 30 Jan 89 Second Edition p 6

[TASS report: "Trip Over"]

[Text] Dubrovnik, 29 Jan—The working visit to the SFRY by L.N. Zaykov, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and first secretary of the Moscow party gorkom, which ended today, was a new link in the permanent political dialogue which has become firmly established in Soviet-Yugoslav cooperation. M.S. Gorbachev's official friendly visit to the SFRY in March last year and the joint declaration adopted on the results of that visit have had the most significant influence on the development of the whole range of relations between the two parties, countries, and peoples.

The consistent implementation of the declaration's provisions and the joint commitment to the principles enshrined in the joint documents reflect the broad prospects for deepening the dynamically developing cooperation between the CPSU and the LCY and the consolidation of our countries' traditional friendship. During L.N. Zaykov's meetings with LCY leaders and representatives of local organs of self-management it was repeatedly stressed that favorable conditions and prerequisites for that now exist. Trust and mutual understanding between the two parties and countries have strengthened, a move is being made toward elaborating a common view of the fundamental tasks of socialist development and ways to resolve international problems, and extra reserves have been found enabling the whole range of Soviet-Yugoslav cooperation to be raised to a new, higher level. The meetings which the CPSU Central Committee secretary had on Yugoslav soil reaffirmed that the trend in relations between our parties and countries is now positive.

To a considerable extent this is the result of the tremendous work in the revolutionary renewal of Soviet society which began in the USSR on the initiative and under the leadership of the USSR. During L.N. Zaykov's conversations with LCY leaders, economic leaders, scientists, specialists, and working people from Yugoslav enterprises the main theme was the idea that restructuring, which is confidently gathering strength in the USSR, and our country's innovative approaches to the solution of international problems are having a growing positive influence on the course of events in the world and are helping to reveal more fully socialism's potential in the interests of all people who cherish peace and progress. Our parties, countries, and peoples, the interlocutors stressed, are also linked by the fact that the LCY is now following the path of implementing profound reforms.

Cooperation between the USSR and SFRY capitals must be an important link in the strengthening of ties. Concrete approaches are needed here, the participants in the conversations noted. There is now much potential for mutually beneficial cooperation in all spheres. The main thing, however, is to achieve this at the level of party organizations and labor collectives. Specific proposals relating to the creation of joint enterprises and the establishment of direct ties in such priority areas as machine building, aircraft building, the development of the light and processing industries, and the improvement of the services sphere were discussed. Yugoslav specialists expressed a particular interest in Soviet subway builders' help in prospecting and planning work on the construction of a subway in the SFRY capital.

Much preparation for concrete joint work has been done. The most important thing now is turn the plans into real deeds.

L.N. Zaykov left for home today.

He was greeted at Moscow airport by A.N. Yakovlev, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and R.P. Fedorov, deputy chief of a CPSU Central Committee department.

M. Veres, SFRY ambassador to the USSR, was among the welcoming party.

Gerasimov, Urban Hold Joint Moscow News Briefing

AU2901211989 Warsaw TRYBUNA LUDU in Polish 25 Jan 89 p 7

[PAP report: "Joint News Conference by Jerzy Urban and Gennadiy Gerasimov in Moscow: What Is Happening in Poland?"]

[Text] PAP—Over 100 Soviet and foreign journalists accredited to the USSR came to the Soviet Foreign Ministry press center on Tuesday [24 January] to meet Jerzy Urban, PPR Government spokesman, in Moscow, at the invitation of the Soviet Foreign Ministry; and Gennadiy Gerasimov; Soviet Foreign Ministry press spokesman.

This joint news conference was organized as a result of the interest caused in the USSR by the changes taking place in Poland, especially in light of the 10th plenum.

J. Urban acquainted the journalists with the contents of the documents adopted by this dramatic, as he called it, PZPR Central Committee plenum. He said that this plenum marks a turning point in Polish domestic policy. The Polish authorities approached this turning point step by step, while pursuing the policy of accord that was certified by General W. Jaruzelski on 13 December 1981.

As recently as 2 years ago, the Western press was presenting Jaruzelski as the Pinochet of the East, said J. Urban. As recently as 2 weeks ago, Rakowski was termed the avowed enemy of "Solidarity."

Following this detailed introduction, which also described the economic reforms and the government's latest moves, Jerzy Urban answered a dozen or so questions about the situation in Poland.

Did Mikhail Gorbachev have a bearing on the plenum's decisions? No, J. Urban replied. Just like all other decisions, our party reached these decisions independently, without consulting Moscow. However, we did find ways of informing interested Soviet leaders about the dramatic course and outcome of the plenum.

As far as Mikhail Gorbachev is concerned, continued J. Urban, he has played a major role in the Polish changes, meaning the political substance and atmosphere of his Polish visit last year. This visit did help modify the political line pursued by a major part of the opposition.

The journalists wanted to know what the PPR Government spokesman thought of "Solidarity's" reaction to the 10th plenum. My assessment of this reaction is positive, J. Urban replied. "Solidarity" has issued a statement saying that it is ready to sit down at the "roundtable," and that it expects all parties belonging to our social arena to place the country's welfare above their own parochial interests. "Solidarity" declares a desire to act in accordance with the law; assures us that the possibility of broad joint activity is now emerging; welcomes the party's support for pluralism, a more democratic social life, and the freedom to associate; and says that the "roundtable" talks should begin as quickly as possible. At the same time, this very same statement contains an entire series of demands which indicate the attitude with which "Solidarity" intends to come to the "roundtable."

What is the attitude of Poles toward the USSR? In reply to this question from a Soviet journalist, Minister Urban presented the results of one of the latest opinion polls. When asked whether the USSR or United States is doing more for world disarmament, 45 percent of the respondents said the USSR, 5 percent said the United States, and 41 percent answered that both countries are displaying good will. As far as an assessment of Soviet-Polish relations is concerned, J. Urban continued, 44 percent of Poland's adult population, taking part in an opinion poll last November, thought that these relations were very good, 8 percent thought they were bad, and 27 percent said they were neither good nor bad. Some 60 percent of respondents said they like the USSR, 21 percent said they did not, and 17 percent had no comment. As for opinions about Mikhail Gorbachev? Almost 80 percent said they like him, 5.2 percent said they do not, and 13 percent had no comment. When asked which world leader they respect the most, 59.4 percent mentioned Gorbachev, 37.4 percent said John Paul II, 2.3 percent said Reagan, and 20 percent said Thatcher. Attitudes toward Gorbachev's politics? Some 68 percent supported Gorbachev's politics, 1.1 percent did not, 18 percent were indifferent to his politics, and 12 percent had no answer. Gorbachev's attitude toward Poland? Some 70 percent said that Gorbachev was kindly disposed toward Poland, 1.7 percent said he was not, and the remainder were not sure.

Commenting on these results, Minister Urban gave an assurance that the attitude of Poles toward the Soviet Union is much better today than it was a few years ago, when, to use his own words, various myths and prejudices were concealed beneath an official layer of icing.

When asked about the outcome of the Polish premier's visit to the FRG, J. Urban said that Premier Rakowski was very pleased with this visit and had considered it very successful. Every West German politician he had spoken to, including Chancellor Kohl, said that a breakthrough was taking place in FRG-Polish relations. Before the visit, we merely expressed a desire for this breakthrough, and tried to aim for it. However, such a breakthrough calls for an examination of a whole series of political and economic problems. In order to solve them together, both governments have appointed plenipotentiaries to conduct these talks. A schedule of meetings is being drawn up. Our foreign minister will visit Bonn in March. When some sort of agreement has been reached in these talks, one can expect Chancellor Kohl to visit Poland, and not too far in the future. His visit would be an opportunity to review Polish-FRG relations in their entirety.

In reply to the next question, Minister Urban assessed the picture of Poland as it is portrayed in the Soviet media. This picture is real and legible, he said. It is a completely different picture compared to what it was before. The Soviet press is presenting various points of view on Polish affairs, with a great degree of knowledge about the Polish reality.

Gennadiy Gerasimov, cohost of the Tuesday news conference, was asked what conclusions the CPSU is drawing from events in Poland over the past decade. He replied that each country is building socialism in its own way and according to its own pattern. The CPSU is examining the experiences of other countries in order to adopt those that seem to be the most useful. For this purpose, we are also examining the Polish experiences, he said.

To this, J. Urban interrupted, I would like to add the fact that Polish ideas are not export commodities. Their quality has not been tested.

When asked for an opinion about the recent border incident between Poland and the GDR, and about the latest occurrences at border crossings, J. Urban said he did not think that a government spokesman should comment on these matters. I believe that the emotions aroused by various incidents involving customs officials on our borders are excessive. Customs regulations simply have to be adapted to the increasing tourist traffic and to the market-financial situation in our countries.

I think this is a matter for CEMA to discuss, G. Gerasimov added. We have read and heard a lot about socialist integration, which is turning into disintegration before our very eyes. I think that the creation of a single socialist market is a major task for CEMA, said G. Gerasimov.

Journalists also asked about the status of talks on the subject of raising relations between Poland and the Vatican to a new level. Minister Urban said that the provisions of a convention which would permit these relations to be upgraded to the ambassadorial level are being prepared. There could be direct talks between the Polish Government and the Vatican today, J. Urban said. The Polish Government is ready for these talks.

When asked how Polish society reacted to the plenum, J. Urban said that most people were very pleased. In the party, however, opinions are divided, but most party members support the plenum results. On the other hand, the OPZZ is the chief center of dissatisfaction. J. Urban explained that the details concerning a future trade union model in Poland will be discussed by one of the trouble-shooting teams during the "roundtable." This team will consist mainly of OPZZ representatives. In other words, no one is going to make a decision about them without their participation.

Another question asked about the plan to withdraw some of the Soviet forces stationed in Poland. With the approval of the Polish authorities, several regiments and several smaller units will be withdrawn this year, and one brigade next year, J. Urban said. He added that the details of this will be established during Polish-Soviet negotiations.

PZPR-CPSU Relations Never 'as Good' as Now

PM3001164989 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 29 Jan 89 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Close Cooperation"]

[Text] Warsaw, 28 Jan—PZPR-CPSU relations have never been as good as they are now, according to Marian Orzechowski, member of the Politburo and secretary of the PZPR Central Committee. Delivering the welcoming address to the 12th Polish-Soviet Friendship Society Congress taking place here on behalf of the leadership of the PZPR, the United Peasant Party, and the Democratic Party, he noted that M.S. Gorbachev's official friendly visit to Poland last year was an event of enormous political significance in the sphere of bilateral ties. The visit signaled a radical breakthrough in the consciousness of millions of Poles and ushered in a new chapter in the book of mutual interest, respect, and sympathy.

The PZPR Central Committee secretary stressed that the close cooperation embraced all spheres of the two country's lives. Its framework, which is defined by the innovative document titled the Declaration on Soviet-Polish Cooperation in the Sphere of Ideology, Science, and Culture, is daily being filled with specific, living substance.

Poland is interested in the Soviet Union as a great socialist power successfully carrying out its revolutionary restructuring program. For its part, the Soviet Union has need of a friendly, socialist Poland—sovereign, strong, stable, and supportive of the ideas of creating a world free of nuclear weapons and building a "common European home." The epoch of restructuring, renewal, reform, and changes in the two countries' lives ushers in unusually broad opportunities for the fraternal peoples. Given these conditions, it is necessary to fundamentally restructure the forms and content of the Polish-Soviet Friendship Society's activity in the spirit of present-day demands, M. Orzechowski observed.

During its discussion at the congress the participants—workers, peasants, schoolchildren, students, and scientists—were unanimous in noting the need to radically transform the Polish-Soviet Friendship Society's work style and methods to bring them into accord with the new quality of Polish-Soviet relations in all spheres of life.

A group of leaders and activists of the Polish-Soviet Friendship Society received high USSR state awards at the Soviet Embassy in Poland today for their great contribution to strengthening friendship between the two countries' peoples. Yu.N. Khristoradnov, head of the delegation of the Union of Soviet Societies for Friendship and Cultural Relations with Foreign Countries Presidium and the Soviet-Polish Friendship Society Central Board attending the 12th Polish-Soviet Friendship Society Congress here, and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Soviet of the Union, presented the Order of the Peoples' Friendship to R. Malinowski, chairman of the Polish-Soviet Friendship Society National Council and marshal of the Polish Sejm, and to H. Bednarski, chairman of the Polish-Soviet Friendship Society Main Board. The Order of the Peoples' Friendship was also conferred on the writer J. Przymanowski, leader of the authors' collective responsible for the book entitled "Pamiec," dedicated to Soviet servicemen who died fighting to free Poland from Hitler's invaders.

Hungarian Troop, Armaments Reductions Reported

LD3001202189 Moscow TASS in English 1923 GMT 30 Jan 89

[Text] Budapest January 30 TASS—The Hungarian Government has decided to reduce the troop stength of the Hungarian People's Army along with armaments and military equipment by almost nine percent in 1989 and 1990, Prime Minister Miklos Nemeth announced on Monday [30 January].

Speaking in the Presidium of the Hungarian Economic Chamber, he said the step, proposed by the national military leadership, is in the interest of continuing the detente process and securing the success of talks on the reduction of Armed Forces and conventional armaments in Europe, according to MTI news agency.

West Europe

Gorbachev To Make State Visit to FRG 12-15 June
LD3001134689 Hamburg DPA in German 1338 GMT 30 Jan 89

[Text] Bonn (DPA)—The Soviet head of state and party leader Mikhail Gorbachev is to pay a state visit to the Federal Republic from 12 to 15 June 1989.

Government spokesman Friedhelm Ost told journalists in Bonn on Monday that he is taking up an invitation from Federal President Richard von Weizsaecker. Ost pointed out that Federal Chancellor Helmut Kohl will be meeting for talks with Gorbachev several times during the state visit.

Gorbachev's Planned UK Visit To Take Place in April
LD3001175489 Moscow TASS in English 1752 GMT 30 Jan 89

[Text] Moscow January 30 TASS—Mikhail Gorbachev's official visit to Britain, originally planned for December 1988, will by agreement take place in the first ten days of April 1989.

Soviet-UK Symposium Discusses European Security
LD2801160889 Moscow TASS in English 1548 GMT 28 Jan 89

[Text] London January 28 TASS—By TASS Correspondent Igor Peskov:

A Soviet-British symposium, which has been held here, discussed European security problems in the light of Mikhail Gorbachev's speech at the United Nations. The symposium was attended by leading employees of the Royal Institute of International Affairs, representatives of the British foreign and defense ministries, a number of other organisations and scientific institutions. Ambassador at Large of the USSR Foreign Ministry Oleg Grinevskiy led the Soviet delegation which included representatives of the foreign ministry, the general staff of the USSR Armed Forces, the Institute of U.S. and Canadian Studies of the USSR Academy of Sciences.

In the course of the symposium British participants noted the great significance of the initiatives that were put forward in Mikhail Gorbachev's speech, the initiatives which outline new ways for development of international relations and the political East-West dialogue. Special attention was paid to problems of reduction of troops and conventional armaments in Europe. In this connection official representatives and scientists of Britain stressed that the Soviet Union-announced major unilateral measures in that area created a favourable climate for the forthcoming Vienna negotiations, and are aimed at holding fruitful discussions and attaining concrete results there. The discussion helped clarify the positions of the sides at these negotitions.

Soviet participants paid much attention to questions linked with realisation of the all-European home concept, further development of the Helsinki process, both in the military-political area and in questions of cooperation in foreign policy, economy and ecology.

The discussion in London was substantive and very interesting, Soviet journalists have been told in an interview by the head of the Soviet delegation. The discussion centered on questions, that were raised by Mikhail Gorbachev in his U.N. speech, problems of European security from the viewpoint of how to give this process more concrete forms, which is necessary to have conventional armaments in Europe reduced, to ensure openness and confidence between the European countries. The specific feature of the dialogue was that the sides expressed their opinions for the first time not as representatives of two blocs but as representatives of two European peoples living on the same continent.

We highly appreciate Mikhail Gorbachev's speech at the United Nations. The proposals made by the Soviet leader in the speech are important, they create a favourable atmosphere for the beginning of negotiations in Vienna, said Deputy Director of the Royal Institute of International Affairs John Roper. These initiatives open up a good possibility for making a serious step towards attaining the goals of these negotations. The discussion held illustrates a new atmosphere and a change in the approach in the relations between our countries. Soviet and British scientists and officials now meet and frankly discuss problems the joint solution of which is bound to promote stronger security in Europe.

UK Cooperation on Alleged Nazis Welcomed
PM3001163389 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 29 Jan 89 Second Edition p 5

[A. Lyutiy article: "Britain-USSR: Contacts Among Lawyers—On the Trail of Nazi Criminals"]

[Text] I had met with Mr Thomas Hetherington in London about a year before. At the time the gray-haired, punctilious Englishman had voiced only guarded optimism in speaking of his upcoming contacts with Soviet lawyers.

The other day, meeting with Hetherington in Moscow, at the USSR Prosecutor's Office, I asked him whether his optimism had waxed or waned.

His reply was terse:

"At the time I expressed the hope of help from the Soviet side. Now, however, I can say that I am receiving it. Our cooperation is superb."

Hetherington is one of the best-known and most respected specialists in the legal sphere in Britain. Until 18 months ago he was director of public prosecutions for England and Wales. Last February he became head of a commission of independent experts charged with gathering and evaluating information on Nazi criminals living in the British Isles. The commission was to present to the British Government in the shortest possible time its opinion as to whether there were suffficient weight of evidence gathered against those under suspicion to warrant a review of certain legislative provisions and the instituting of criminal proceedings. The point is that under present English law Nazis who found asylum in Britain do not fall within its jurisdiction, since they did not commit their crimes on British territory and at the time of committing them were not UK subjects.

It is strange, of course, that a legal paradise for these people should exist to this day in a state that formed part of the anti-Hitler coalition. It is also strange that their exposure should only now have been taken up at government level. The press and television in Britain, however, have long been sounding the alarm.

But today is not perhaps the time to engage in mutual recriminations.

"Better later than never," was the well-known saying used by Vladimir Ivanovich Andreyev, member of the USSR Prosecutor's Office Collegium and coordinator of the work of providing assistance to the Hetherington group. He added that the energy with which the British have gotten down to business can only be welcomed. Hetherington himself is already making his second, very tightly scheduled visit to the USSR since the commission was set up, questioning witnesses and gathering material. On the day we met, he was in transit through Moscow. He had previously visited Lithuania and Latvia with aides. After Moscow he was headed for the Ukraine and Belorussia.

I asked Hetherington how many people were on the suspect list.

"Roughly 250. But some of them, we have determined, are now dead. There are also people who have left the country."

"Can you give any specific names?"

"I can name only one, since he has already been mentioned in the British press. He is called Gecas (Antanas Gecevicius). I shall refrain from naming the remainder."

That restraint was explained by V.I. Andreyev:

"It is indeed somewhat premature to talk about each specific case at present. We do know that there are Nazi criminals in Britain. But a prosecutor can say that a person has committed a crime only after he has gathered the evidence. We are therefore now doing all we can to help the British collect as many facts as possible. As far as Gecas (he served in a punitive battalion in Lithuania—A.L.) is concerned, we do have evidence on him. We did, incidentally, demand his extradition in the past, but without success."

A question to Hetherington:

"Is it possible to conclude an agreement between Soviet and British lawyers on the principles of collaboration in such situations?"

"I would wholly welcome it, like the cooperation between us in other spheres; for example, in combating drug trafficking and terrorism. Certain steps have already been taken here. I should say that this has been greatly helped by the present improvement in Soviet-British relations. We feel that we are being helped here by good friends."

V.I. Andreyev:

"But do bear in mind that very many things divide the representatives of our profession. We lawyers are rather strict people. We do, after all, have rules of procedure in our country, but we are overcoming the barriers."

The future will show what the results of the Hetherington commission's activity are. But one can say right now that a pretty good precedent, a basis for further useful contacts between Soviet and British lawyers, has been created.

Bessmertnykh Recieves Turkish Ambassador 30 Jan

LD3001204689 Moscow TASS in English 1929 GMT 30 Jan 89

[Text] Moscow January 30 TASS—Aleksandr Bessmertnykh, first deputy foreign minister of the USSR, today received Volkan Vural, ambassador of the Republic of Turkey to the USSR, at the latter's request.

During the talk they discussed several issues of Soviet-Turkish political and economic relations and also the situation forming around Afghanistan.

Political & Social

PRAVDA Previews Next Stage of Election Process

PM2601160689 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 26 Jan 89 Second Edition p 1

[Unattributed article: "Approaching the Elections"; in PRAVDA's 26 January first edition this item is signed "The Social Policy and Communist Education Department"]

[Text] There has probably never before been so much discussion of the elections of candidate USSR people's deputies as there now is. Passions really seethed at meetings and conferences, and in the labor collectives where possible contenders were named. Heated discussions and fierce disputes took place at plenums of social organizations, sometimes lasting until late at night.

"That is real democracy," some people say, with satisfaction.

"This democracy causes nothing but trouble, a great deal of demagoguery, and fuss," others complain.

Let us not be too quick to reject the second view out of hand. It must be admitted that in some places they failed to avoid group egotism, ambition, and political careerism. But it is unlikely that anyone will dispute the fact that democracy is developing, moving far and wide. And that is again convincingly demonstrated by the election campaign.

The people have woken up, so to speak, they have begun to feel that they are the masters in their own socialist home. Inertia and social apathy are giving way to civil activeness. People realize that the formation of the body of deputies will largely determine the future of restructuring.

The election campaign has entered a new stage. The registration of candidate USSR people's deputies for territorial and national territorial okrugs is under way. It may be noted with satisfaction that the wave of people's initiative has brought to the top, first and foremost, the active champions of restructuring. And that is the most important thing. They include Communists and nonparty people, workers and peasants, intelligentsia, veterans and young people, women, and representatives of various nations.

Meetings between candidate deputies and voters begin 26 January. And they will differ in many ways from those that were held in the old days. The contenders will express their views on the resolution of current problems. Social organizations have published their programs. And it is characteristic that they are all based on the CPSU political platform, which expresses the interests of the whole people.

The CPSU Central Committee appeal to Communists and the Soviet people incorporates the diversity of opinions and aspirations of various strata of society and clearly designates the objectives and tasks the party has set for the immediate future and its plans as it approaches the elections of people's deputies to the supreme organ of power.

The cornerstone of this political platform is concern for man, for increasing his prosperity, and for improving Soviet people's life. The party cares about the people's pressing needs, and it is working steadfastly to enable us to live better in the next few years. True, not everything we do today works out. And there are people who are frightened by that, who panic. Others are keen to impose their cherished commands and orders on the people again.

But there is no going back, only ahead! And the main condition for success, as the document says, is for every one of us to be an active participant in the implementation of all our plans and to conscientiously carry out the task entrusted to him.

The CPSU Central Committee calls for the election campaign to be used to improve all our work. It is important to realise that everyone who works for restructuring is working for himself, for his family's well-being and the prosperity of our motherland. Restructuring must be defended and, most importantly, carried forward.

The present election campaign has posed many new and interesting problems and unusual demands and tasks. Their realization requires substantial ideological work. Unfortunately, as the editorial mail shows, this work is not always up to today's requirements. It is necessary to resolutely overcome stereotypes and do everything to promote the successful holding of elections on the basis of principles arising from the objectives of our policy. All of society has an interest in ensuring that this very important campaign is in line with the processes of restructuring.

The party appeals:

Let the forthcoming elections of USSR people's deputies be a school of democracy, a triumph for full people's power!

Let us fulfill this appeal!

Outline of Sakharov Program

PM2701153289 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 27 Jan 89 p 2

[Answer to reader's letter as part of "Dialogue: Ask Us Your Questions!" feature by V. Volodin, A. Dyatlov, A. Trushkin, O. Tekhmenev, V. Umnov, A. Shumskiy, and V. Korolev: "Whose Candidate Is Sakharov?"—first paragraph is reader's letter]

[Text] Has Academician Sakharov been nominated as a candidate people's deputy? Can you quote any extracts from his program?

[Signed] A. Gordin, Moscow.

Although around 60 scientific institutes expressed unequivocally a preliminary desire to nominate A.D. Sakharov as a candidate people's deputy, at an extended session of the USSR Academy of Sciences Presidium the academician failed to collect the necessary number of votes. Scientific societies of the Academy of Sciences were also unable to nominate A.D. Sakharov—it turns out that he does not belong to any of these organizations.

The 2,500 Muscovites who came to Cinema House to nominate Andrey Dmitriyevich as candidate for Moscow national territorial Okrug No 1, RSFSR, could not get into the small auditorium. The vote was: 947 "for," against—zero, abstentions—zero.

Here is just a small part of the new candidate's program that our correspondent managed to note: Construction of underground AES's... Legalization of and support for ecological movements... Lifting of all restrictions on personal income... Regular publication, at least once a year, of the expenditure of social funds... Freedom to choose your country of residence and place of residence within the country... Elections with a mandatory requirement of at least two candidates per seat... Gradual abolition of the passport system... No increase in prices of industrial goods and food until there has been a comprehensive study of the consequences... Financial incentives for women who devote themselves to raising preschool children... Open up the archives of the NKVD [People's Commissariat for Internal Affairs] and MGB [Ministry of State Security]... Trial by jury... Presence of an attorney from the start of investigation... Humanization of places of imprisonment... Abolition of the death penalty... Rapprochement between the socialist and capitalist systems—the only means of salvation from thermonuclear catastrophe.

Scientists, Other Candidates Listed

PM3101090589 [Editorial Report] Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 28 January 1989 Morning Edition carries on page 3 under the headline "Nomination Echo" an exchange of telegrams on USSR people's deputy nominations.

In response to a telegram on the USSR Academy of Sciences' failure to nominate Academicians Sakharov, Likhachev, and Sagdeyev as candidates, IZVESTIYA explains that Academician Sakharov, "nominated by the 'Memorial' movement election action group," was confirmed as candidate for Moscow National Territorial Okrug No 1. IZVESTIYA continues: "A. Sakharov has also been nominated as a candidate for Moscow National Territorial Okrug No 2 and for a number of other electoral okrugs.

"Academician R. Sagdeyev has been nominated as candidate people's deputy for Cheremushkinskiy Electoral Okrug No 26.

"Academician D. Likhachev has been nominated as Soviet Culture Foundation candidate people's deputy."

An unattributed report printed at the bottom of the same page under the heading "At the USSR Academy of Sciences Scientific Societies and Associations Electoral Commission" lists, with biographical details, the USSR Academy of Sciences scientific societies' and associations' registered candidate deputies: N.P. Bekhtereva, N.N. Vorontsov, O.G. Gazenko, T.I. Zaslavskaya, V.M. Kotlyakov, L.A. Kuznetsov, S.B. Lavrov, B.F. Lomov, G.S. Khromov, G.Kh. Shakhnazarov, V.K. Shumnyy, A.V. Yablokov, and A.L. Yanshin.

Music Store Workers Announce Strike, Make Demands

PM3101101989 Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian 31 Jan 89 p 4

[Report by "our special correspondent" P. Gurin: "Interrupted 'Melody'; On Incident in Record Store"]

[Text] Moscow—A poster announcing a strike appeared yesterday on the doors of the trade-name store 'Melodiya' on Lenin Avenue. The entire collective went to work but the store did not open at the fixed time.

The point was that it became known here 20 January that 10 days previously a ministerial decree had been published on... the closing of the store. Let us immediately reassure music lovers that records will continue to be sold here. It is not the trading center but the collective which is being done away with. It is planned to do exactly the same with the central gramophone record house. On the basis of these organizations the leadership of the "Melodiya" firm intends to create a wholesale and retail store. Why have these plans given rise to such an adverse reaction?

"Because the decision was made without consulting the collective," store director R. Mamedov believes.

But I think it is not so much a case of grievances as of interests. For 2 years now the "Melodiya" on Lenin Avenue has been run on the basis of economic accountability [khozraschet]. Customers have probably noticed this: Whereas previously the store operated from 1000 to 1900 with a lunch break now it operates from 0900 to 2000 without a break. In addition the selection of records is the most extensive in Moscow. What compelled them to work better? Economic independence. "Melodiya" makes a good profit. And the higher the profit, the better the workers live. For instance, the store pays for its employees' lunch, uniforms and vouchers for excursions and sanatoriums have become free, and following a decision of the collective the shared-ownership debts of two workers for cooperative apartments were extinguished.... In brief, people began to understand the meaning of the word "owner," started thinking about leasing, and elected a new director... Perhaps that was why they became inconvenient to the leaders? After all, they are already stating frankly that they need neither the firm nor the central house of gramophone records. They manage themselves, having set up direct ties with the plant. And they immediately grasped the main idea in the plan to create a wholesale and retail store: enhancing the degree of management, that is removing independence.

Incidentally, beforehand the store workers had distributed letters to all levels of administration warning them of the decision to hold a strike and making demands: that the entire collective be appointed to work at the new enterprise and that a contract be concluded with it on the collective contract while maintaining the collective's own current account. No one has taken account of these demands....

NKAO Committee Completes First Week

PM3001170589 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 28 Jan 89 First Edition p 5

[Special correspondent Lieutenant Colonel N. Belan telephone dispatch: "Nagorno-Karabakh: The Committee in Action"]

[Text] Stepanakert, 27 Jan—A special form of administration, temporarily introduced by a USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium decree, has been in operation in the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO] since 20 January. An NKAO Special Administration Committee was formed with A. Volskiy, chief of a CPSU Central Committee department, as chairman. Of course, a week's work is rather a brief period to speak of any results, but even the initial steps taken by the committee inspire great hope among the oblast's inhabitants.

"I've been working as a teacher for more than 50 years, 45 of them as director of the local school," S. Aliyev said. "Let me tell you, we've had a lot of painful problems, especially recently. We need a new school building—the one where children are being taught today has only four classrooms. We need a medical services station—it is still housed in the library building. The store shelves are completely empty. As for the club house where we are now sitting, it is falling apart..."

Was the old teacher alone in speaking about pressing problems? No, there seemed to be an endless number of people wanting to have their say. At least 200 persons had assembled in the club house.

That was a meeting with residents of Kirkidzhan, a suburban district of Stepanakert. The residents are mainly Azerbaijanis. Internal Troops Major General S. Kupreyev and S. Babayan, both members of the NKAO Special Administration Committee, went there to chat with them and learn about their immediate worries and mood. The ensuing conversation was frank and confiding. People immediately sensed that the committee members were concerned about their fate, and repaid this with reciprocity. It was not only social and daily life problems that were discussed at the meeting. The interlocutors reflected on ways to continue living in a single multinational home and to ensure that harmony and fraternal relations prevail inside it.

"This is not a question of two peoples falling out: We Armenian and Azerbaijani working people have nothing to argue about," D. Salakhov, electrician at the Karabakh silk combine, said, for example. "The conflict was provoked and fanned by thieves and bribe-takers, the bosses of the black economy."

That was also said by many other workers. Yes, people have figured out what had happened. There has been time for calm interpretation of past events.

"The remarkable point, I think, is that all this has been understood," Maj Gen Kupreyev said. "I was also pleased to hear you say something else: You approve of the temporary introduction of a special form of administration in the oblast. But you do realize that the committee will be unable to solve all problems by itself, without your support. You and you alone are the ones to impose order at local level."

That meeting was just one element of the committee's current activity. Following a brief morning discussion of current tasks, its members make their way to the labor collectives, to the masses, every day. This is done in order to get a more detailed idea of the state of affairs at local level, to learn the mood of the oblast's inhabitants, and to influence them wherever necessary—to teach them constructive approaches to the solution of economic and social problems.

"I've just visited the dairy combine and the No 4 kindergarten in Stepanakert," I was told by committee member V. Mishin, Secretary of the AUCCTU. "For example, I asked the kindergarten workers: How many Azerbaijani women do you have working here? We had two, they answered, but they left and went somewhere else a few months ago. And what about you, I continued my questioning: Did you not get on with them? Of course we did, they ardently assured me. We Armenian women lived in harmony with them and we want them to come back. Just a small fragment of life, but it is a problem, and a problem which is not exclusive to this collective alone. Much remains to be done for people to return to work fully. After all, the mutual insults are still live; good mutual relations have to be organized."

This is also realized by the people. For example, I traveled with Colonel A. Naumenko, chief of the NKAO Special District Political Department, to the repair workshops of the kolkhoz named for Twice Hero of the Soviet Union N. Stepanyan. That was yesterday. Workshop chief K. Agadzhanyan, fitter L. Vartanyan, and others were unanimous in their opinions: The working people got fed up with interethnic dissension a long time ago.

"My sister is married to an Azerbaijani. They live in Agdam," Vartanyan said. "Who cares about dissension? Now we've got other things to worry about: We've got to think about the spring sowing, and we are short of spare parts. These are the real complications."

And workers in Kirkidzhan said:

"Our worries are the same—to feed our families, to get clothes and shoes for our kids; these are the headaches. Never mind interethnic arguments."

But it would be naive to assume that all has now receded into the past. Manifestations of the former emotions can still be encountered in the public mood. By no means everyone is prepared to abandon mutual recriminations and the settling of accounts.

"This is why the main point for us today is to gain the confidence of the broadest masses," the KRASNAYA ZVEZDA correspondent was told by committee member V. Sidorov, senior official from the CPSU Central Committee. "People's reaction to the committee's formation was not the same throughout the oblast. That is a fact, it is a reality. And so is it a fact that the situation will not be changed just by speeches to labor collectives. We will be judged by our specific action in the economy, in the social sphere, in cultural life. So much has been neglected there. The economy was being run at an unprofessional level, if modern yardsticks are applied. What is needed is accelerated development of the oblast's production forces, reconstruction of enterprises, sovkhozes, and kolkhozes, and a transfer to self-financing and economic accountability; lease relations and family and collective contracts need to be introduced. We must create a local construction industry base, we must boost housing construction... All these and many other tasks will have to be solved. This week, for example, we and representatives of the USSR Ministry of Communications signed a protocol on basic measures—a lot is going to be done to install telephones in the oblast, improve postal services, develop television services... And this is only a beginning."

Yes, 7 days really are a brief period of time. But even this very first week proves that the committee is engaged in active work.

Aganbegyan Defends Baykal-Amur Railroad

OW2901020789 [Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 0410 GMT on 24 January, in its 10-minute "Restructuring Spotlight" program, carries a report by Amur Oblast television correspondent Vladimir Kovalchuk on controversies surrounding the Baykal-Amur Main Railroad (BAM) project.

The program begins with several brief interviews, the first with Academician A.G. Aganbegyan, who says: "BAM is a kind of banner. It is a major construction project, and we can be proud of it." Video cuts to show Professor G.Kh. Popov, chief editor of the VOPROSY EKONOMIKI journal, who says: "What did the country, the nation, the people know at the time the decision to build the BAM was adopted? They knew from the available data that in our country the situation was so acute that if BAM was not built life could not continue. There were also other areas in our country, such as housing construction, our textiles industry, and the environment in the cities that also demanded investments. Who decided which of these expenditures was the most important, whether funds should be invested in the BAM first or whether they should be invested in other areas of development of our national economy?"

Video cuts to show an unidentified man who says: "As a citizen, as a person, a Russian, I consider that in time, and in the not-too-distant future the younger generation—and I do not mean our descendants, but our younger generation—will say thank you for building the BAM." Video cuts to show Ye.V. Basin, USSR deputy minister of transport construction, who says: "When was it considered and by whom that investments in the construction of roads was a waste of time?" Video cuts to show correspondent Kovalchuk in the studio recalling the history of the BAM project, from late in the last century to the present. As video shows documentary films recording the construction of the railroad in the seventies, he notes the nationwide nature of the "Project of the Century." Following shots showing the last rail being laid linking the entire line, Kovalchuk says: "The BAM workers at the time had no idea of what awaited them. What awaited them was a slack period at first when the project was forgotten, and then a time during which a critical reappraisal was made. In the press the railroad was even described as the longest memorial of the period of stagnation."

Kovalchuk is then shown in a settlement interviewing engineer T.A. Vasina, who recalls the efforts of Komsomol construction teams 15 years ago and expresses indignation that the project is associated with the period of stagnation. Video again shows G.Kh. Popov, who says: "The BAM must be preserved both as a railroad and as part of our national economy. Second, I think it is absolutely essential to push ahead with the recommendations made long ago by scientists relating to development of the entire BAM zone."

Video again cuts to show A.G. Aganbegyan, who says: "Construction of the BAM was a mistake. Very well, scratch it out, there is no BAM. What would we have to do? We would have to stop increasing the hauling of freight to the Far East and from the Far East. We would have to stop international ties, to some extent, from Japan and other countries to the European countries. You have probably noticed the terminals at Vostochnyy Port; you probably saw the trains hauling containers. Well, we would have to begin restricting all this sharply. These restrictions would bring a loss to our country in 5 to 10 years that would be several times greater than the additional expenditures on the new transport route."

Kovalchuk tries to say something, but Aganbegyan continues: "Therefore the BAM is a very essential railroad and there is no alternative to BAM other than a third track on the Transsib [Trans-Siberian Railroad]. We cannot simply decide not to build the BAM."

Kovalchuk notes that he has visited various sections of the project many times and says: "The people, the people of the Far East presently bear a grudge towards scientists for not demonstrating a sufficiently principled stand, for not expressing their protest, for example, on behalf of the Council on Developing the BAM Region. After all, one cannot..." Aganbegyan interrupts: "Tell me, these protesting people, where were they at that time? Why did they remain silent. After all, they elected their deputies, they elected their oblast leadership. Where were they? They think that a group of 10, 20, or 30 scientists can do what millions of people do not do."

Kovalchuk says: "You know these people were engaged in specific jobs and they did them quite well, I would say." Aganbegyan again interjects: "What about the scientists, they were not engaged in specific things?" Kovalchuk says: "People trust in scientists." Aganbegyan laughs, and says: "Who did they elect as their bosses?" Kovalchuk presses on and notes that the people believed in the work of the scientists, yet the work "ended up suspended somewhere in limbo, and we are now forced to untangle mistakes of the past."

As video shows a settlement on the BAM, Kovalchuk notes that mistakes were made and wonders how people who built the BAM and settled here perceive all this. He interviews a metalworker who expresses indignation over the fact that the opinions of workers are being disregarded, that even station names, like Kuanda, have been changed, and despite negative articles in the press, the BAM people are not permitted to defend themselves.

Kovalchuk is shown back in the studio where he notes that the controversy around the BAM heated up in particular after publication of the 20 September 1988 issue of GUDOK. He cites a report on the session of the collegium of the Ministry of Railways that stressed the losses incurred by the BAM, and cites suggested alternatives to improve the situation. Video then cuts to show Kovalchuk interviewing N.K. Isingarin, USSR deputy minister of railways, who says: "Presently this issue remains on the agenda insofar as the profitability of the BAM remains on the agenda."

Video again cuts to show Kovalchuk talking to Aganbegyan. Kovalchuk notes that presently the problem of what freight to haul over the BAM is bothering many people. Aganbegyan says: "This should not bother anyone right now. The BAM has not yet been fully commissioned. As soon as the BAM has been fully commissioned, all freight destined for northern Yakutiya—not over the Transsib with transshipment over the lesser BAM—should be hauled over the BAM." Kovalchuk suggests this will be done by diverting trains from the Transsib, to which Aganbegyan agrees.

Kovalchuk is then again shown interviewing Ye. V. Basin, and asks him when the railroad will really get to work. Basin says this will occur after the permanent commissioning of its entire length, planned for 1989. He notes that a 5-6 kilometer open section over the Severomuyskiy Range is presently an obstacle holding things up, but generally lauds the project, which in contrast to many other areas of the country has seen a transport artery built into an area before it is opened up for development.

In conclusion, video shows Kovalchuk again talking to Popov. Kovalchuk says: "One gets the impression that it is to somebody's advantage to defame the BAM project." Popov replies: "As a person who was engaged in administrative matters, I can say only one thing: Any attempts to cut a single economic entity into pieces and try to operate these sections separately usually leads to much greater losses in the long run than when we use a single entity. Frankly, I think there is a purely departmental lining in this entire matter. When they talk of the railroad as a whole, we have a resulting loss of R200 million, a large sum. If we break it down into three parts, for example, then naturally these R200 million will disappear as a loss and some other figures will appear, and naturally each one of them will be considerably less than R200 million." Kovalchuk notes that this action "is not only useless, it is harmful," to which Popov replies: "Its prospects are very harmful, in my opinion, because when we begin to divide something in the economy between departments, we always make the situation worse as a result. It is quite obvious that if things here also are broken into various parts, then of course we will not have an improvement in the situation."

Armenian Appointments, Dismissals Reported

NC3101105489 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian 0300 GMT 31 Jan 89

[Text] The Armenian Republic's Council of Ministers appointed Comrade (Ruben Mkrtich Shishdalanyan) as first deputy chairman of the Armenian Republic's State Agro-Industrial Committee. The Armenian Republic's Council of Ministers relieved Comrade (Gamlet Garegin Navasardyan) from his duties as deputy chairman of the Armenian Republic's State Planning Committee in view of his retirement. Comrade [first name indistinct] (Dalilyan) was relieved of his duties as the Armenian Republic's deputy minister of road construction and maintenance in view of his retirement.

Armenia Quake Commission on Restoration Problems

PM3101110389 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 29 Jan 89 Second Edition p 2

[TASS report: "At the CPSU Central Committee Politburo Commission: Valuing People's Trust"]

[Text] Reports that the foundations have been laid of the first apartment blocks in the earthquake-stricken cities of Armenia have been received by the population with mixed feelings. On the one hand, it is of course gratifying that there are visible signs appearing of the restoration of destroyed buildings, but on the other, questions arise as to whether the new cities and villages will be better than the previous ones and whether they will retain their purely Armenian coloring and the distinctiveness of the national architecture, and why not a single one of the promised open reviews and discussions of the new building plans and models has taken place.

The need to provide the public with more information on decisions taken was stressed at the latest working session of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo commission conducted by L.A. Voronin, deputy chairman of the of the USSR Council of Ministers, on 28 January. The commission instructed the leaders of planning and construction organizations to keep the inhabitants of Armenia regularly informed on the main phases of the work under way, making extensive use of the republic mass media, radio, and television to this end. People's trust should be valued and care taken to ensure that no discrepancy arises between word and deed.

The commission examined a detailed schedule of planned work with a view to ensuring that all organizations engaged in construction in the cities in the disaster zone will have started work by 1 February. Thus a map dividing Leninakan up into seismic microregions has already been drawn up, which will enable large-scale construction to begin ahead of schedule.

There are more than 1,500 apartment blocks in the northern cities of the republic which can be reoccupied provided that they are structurally reinforced and thoroughly overhauled. Each such block requires a work plan. The commission has demanded that the drafting of these plans be speeded up, since in Kirovakan alone the housing problems of 80,000 people could be solved by restoring damaged apartment blocks.

Individual construction should be expanded, particularly as the republic has been allocated three times as much construction materials for sale to the population this year as last. However, the construction of individual homes is being held up at local level on the pretext that there is a lack of vacant sites for new building. Local staffs and party and soviet workers must show more responsibility and initiative in tackling current problems and not shift the work on to republic or even central bodies.

On the allocation of sites for new construction the commission confirmed its principled stance regarding the impermissibility of using arable land for that purpose. Local authorities must draw people's attention to plots that are unsuitable for agriculture and land with steep gradients, since construction is possible there with appropriate preparation.

The commission has regularly decided at each session to carry out a detailed analysis of progress in restoring specific cities, rayon centers, and workers' settlements. The present session examined the regeneration of Kirovakan—the construction of accomodation, schools, kindergartens, and sociocultural facilities and job placement. A decision was taken to develop Kirovakan railroad station, whose freight turnover is to triple in the next few years.

The work carried out in Kirovakan to resume school classes was approved by the commission: All schoolchildren are now back at their desks.

S.G. Arutyunyan, first secretary of the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee, took part in the session's work.

Tajik Quake Relief Work Continues Despite Snow

PM3001162589 Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian 28 Jan 89 p 2

[Own correspondent V. Yurlov report: "Earthquake in Tajikistan: The Bitter Concerns of Current Days"]

[Text] Tajik SSR—Since the morning snow has been falling in Tajikistan. In normal circumstances people would be pleased. It means there will be a harvest. But today everyone in the republic is worried by the thought: What is happening in the earthquake zone? Will the children not freeze to death? Will the additional precipitation not cause new landslides?

These are no idle questions. As is known, an irrigation canal runs through the earthquake zone, watering vineyards on the surrounding hills. Some people have linked the two landslides with the human earthworks.

"This is not so," G. Koshlakov, first deputy chairman of the Tajik SSR Council of Ministers and a geologist with a long working experience, said. "We have data at our disposal which show that the earthquake triggered a peculiar physical phenomenon in the loess soils—water entered a free state. This has been observed elsewhere in the world."

Scientists have yet to draw the final conclusions. I can testify that walking on a landslide is not a pleasant occupation. It is like walking on jelly. And the size of the "jelly" is impressive. It is 8 km wide and more than 2 km long. And the layer of mud is up to 12 meters deep in places.

It is difficult to believe that there ever was life here. Only a handful of hay underfoot indicates that there was a livestock unit here where 13 girls came running in the morning to milk the cows. All of them were buried. The landslide cut short 274 lives. This is the exact figure cited at a press conference for Soviet and foreign journalists by K. Makhkamov, first secretary of the Tajik Communist Party Central Committee. Of 73 people who were hospitalized, 17 have been released in a satisfactory condition. The others remain under observation by Tajik or Moscow specialists.

The snow falls incessantly. Work, too, continues incessantly. An excavator is digging a deep trench in the landslip. Why? "They are looking for relatives of the mechanized mobile column leader who were killed," the message goes round. "If they find them, they will stop digging." The scoop catches some clothing and bedding and empties it to one side. It is obvious what may happen next. I cannot bear to watch. Pushing through the dense crowd, I make my way to a group of children standing nearby.

They are warmly dressed. Yet something is wrong. What is it? Suddenly I realize: There are no toys, no smiles. Children that do not smile—that is not normal. From the road the smell of fresh pilaff is wafting over. The food is free. However, no delicacy in the world can entice the children. Parents lead them away.

Field kitchens have been organized in many places, mainly where quick-assembly chalets, yurts, and tents have been put up. Some 120 mobile homes, 300 shepherds' huts, and 170 yurts have arrived in the stricken zone. Some of the inhabitants have been billeted in administrative buildings or with relatives. This is not enough. Tajikistan has gratefully accepted fraternal republics' offers to provide temporary housing. Every passing day reveals more and more houses that are unfit to live in. As time passes, the true scale of the damage is revealed. To date it is estimated at R17 million. Tomorrow, most likely, this figure will be bigger.

The snow and the restoration effort continue unabated.

Relief 'Mistakes,' Current Needs

LD3001115189 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0900 GMT 30 Jan 89

[Excerpts] [Presenter] We are now going to go over to Dushanbe, the capital of Tajikistan. Today, comrades, it is exactly 1 week since alarming words like "killed", "injured", "evacuated", "made homeless", "headquarters operating" once again hit the airwaves: Once again we had a tragedy, once again we had an earthquake, this time in Tajikistan. [passage omitted] Our correspondent (Svetlana Sterligova) is in the studio in Dushanbe and she has been visiting the disaster area:

[Sterligova] [passage omitted] As you already no doubt know from reports in the press, on the radio and on television, an extraordinary government commission was set up immediately after the earthquake to deal with the consequences of the natural disaster. At first it was thought the actual figure has turned out to be smaller. Today we know that precisely 274 people died, though you have to agree that even one human life is actually beyond price.

[Presenter] Yes, of course, of course. It is very hard indeed to listen to all of this, Svetlana. How do things look there now? Work is going on, is it?

[Sterligova] Yes, of course it's going on, but I don't want to create illusions that everything was organized in an ideal way right from the beginning. Despite the promptness of many services, technical, medical and rescue services, there were a lot of organizational mistakes at first. Serious, very serious complications in the work of the rescuers were created simply by the huge numbers of people. There were apparently enough mobile catering points but to begin with they were not distributed very evenly and were often a long way from where the digging was being done. Now, however, all the faults of the first few days have been taken into consideration and there is more organization and order. Furthermore when I was in the stricken localities I was able to talk to the cadi of the republic, that is the leader of all the religious associations of Tajikistan, Akbar Kakharov: He has been performing the Muslim last rites over the people who have died and calling upon his fellow countrymen and the inhabitants of the stricken villages not to give way to panic and to maintain their endurance and courage.

[Presenter] I see. Svetlana, is it warm there now? How are the people who have lost their homes keeping warm at night?

[Sterligova] At the end of last week, you know, the weather got much colder and there was snow falling: Today, too, there has been a light covering and the tents, the shepherds' huts and the yurts which began to come in immediately after the event from Uzbekistan, Kirghizia, Kazakhstan and other republics have been more useful than anything else.

[Presenter] I see. Svetlana, what ought to be sent to the victims? Our people, you know, are very charitable and are willing to send anything, but perhaps there are things that are not needed that they shouldn't waste their time bothering about? What do you need now?

[Sterligova] Literally this morning, you know, I spoke to the republican headquarters for the provision of relief to the victims and I was told that R1.81 million had already been paid in to Account No 730. Aircraft carrying medicines, warm items and foodstuffs are landing at Dushanbe airport every day. And I would like to avail myself of the opportunity offered by the fact that the whole country is now listening to us—at the headquarters they asked me first and foremost, of course, to convey heartfelt thanks to everyone who has responded to our misfortune, but also to say that there is now no need for all those things I have already mentioned, nor does the republic need teams of rescue workers, there is no need for them....

[Presenter, interrupting] You are getting by with your own efforts, are you?

[Sterligova] Yes, yes, the republic can see to all that itself: But we do not yet have enough timber accommodation cabins—the type that are on wheels—we do not have enough yurts and insulated tents. And I repeat, they must be heat-insulated because, you understand, it's winter here. [passage omitted]

Pope Cables Gorbachev

LD2701222289 Moscow TASS in English 1712 GMT 27 Jan 89

[Text] Rome January 27 TASS—Pope John Paul II sent a personal telegram to Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev over the earthquake in Tajikistan.

He said, among other things: "Saddened by another tragic natural calamity which has struck your counry, I consider it my Christian duty to express my deepest condolences to your excellency, the families of the victims and all the inhabitants of Tajikistan where the quake caused substantial damage and took many lives."

Estonian Independence Party Criticized

PM3001151289 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 29 Jan 89 First Edition p 2

[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA correspondent Lieutenant Colonel S. Pashayev article: "What the Central Press 'Hushed Up,' or What Kind of 'Transformations' Certain 'Champions of National Interests' Are Campaigning for Today"]

[Text] We are only just learning democracy, only just beginning to grasp its first lessons, discovering unexpectedly that it seems to be far easier to declare one's adherence to the ideas of pluralism than to make it the norm of relations in practice, a natural element of our inner political ethos.

There are still many among us who are not averse to interpreting glasnost as merely the unrestricted right to publish one's own individual opinion. Yet debate and polemics mean not only the opportunity to speak, but also, necessarily, the willingness to listen and hear someone else's view.

Unfortunately this one-sided interpretation of glasnost is now a very widespread phenomenon. During a recent assignment to Tallinn I had an opportunity to study the content of a document that is noteworthy in this respect. In one of its resolutions the Estonian People's Front Duma tries without foundation to accuse the central press of disinformation, of trying to disrupt the unity of democratic forces and discredit the restructuring process taking place in the Estonian SSR.

What is the basis for these claims to the sole right to speak for all "democratic forces of the Estonian SSR"? Is it appropriate to speak of their unity when worried calls for consolidation are still ringing out from every platform in the republic? Lastly, does everything now happening in Estonia's sociopolitical life fit simply and easily into the framework of the genuine restructuring process; does it serve progress and the cause of socialism? The authors of the resolution, noticing only negative assessments in central press publications, seeing tendentiousness everywhere, and interpreting anxiety as malice, have evidently not given this very much thought.

Yet it is no secret that the democratization process in Estonia is not easy and is not devoid of attempts by certain forces to lay claim to being the sole arbiters of political fashion and to exploiting the situation for their own far-from-decent purposes. So how can all this be a forbidden topic for the press?

Naturally, such extremes do not reflect the position of the working people of Estonia, the majority of whom sincerely long for the success of restructuring, democratic changes, and the cleansing of the debris of Stalinism and the dross of stagnation from socialism. But certain problems that have emerged here recently are not at all local or regional in nature.

However, in reporting on the mass social movements that have sprung up in Estonia on the wave of democratization, and describing clashes in their relationships, the central press has indeed shown some onesidedness in that it has overlooked the smaller social organizations, of which, it must be said, there are many here. They include the Society for the Preservation of Ancient Monuments, the Estonian Christian Union, the Tallinn Independent Detachment, the Forum of Independent Youth... It is hardly necessary to point out that the picture of the republic's sociopolitical life is incomplete without the ideas propagandized by the members of these and similar groups.

Indeed, is there not a certain eloquence in the demands of the so-called Vyru "No. 1 Free Independent Youth Column" to perpetuate the memory of the "freedom-fighters," the White Estonians who drowned the Estonian Labor Commune in blood? Or in the slogans with which they picketed the Vyruskiy Rayon people's court and prosecutor's office: "Down with the soviets," "Strip the Communists of power"?

Or take the Estonian National Independence Party [ENIP]. I talked with Arvo Pesti, leader of its Tallinn section and member of the ENIP council, and studied a whole series of documents that its supporters have disseminated at rallies and posted on improvised billboards.

What do they want, these people who founded their own "party" last August? Paragraph one of the ENIP statutes formulates clearly and unequivocally the main aim of this "political association of individuals": "restoration of the independence of the democratic Estonian state." In what way? Arvo Pesti makes no secret of it: in the form of the separation of Estonia from the USSR and its restoration to the 1940 borders.

"This must happen sooner or later, whether Moscow likes it or not," he states. Adding: "For our part, we will do everything to put this into practice as quickly as possible."

The ENIP organizers do not now stand on ceremony in their attempt somehow to justify the necessity and legality of their frankly separatist intentions. In the "Political Declaration of the Founding Congress" they shamelessly misrepresent the nature of relations between the peoples of the USSR and interpret history to suit themselves.

Their three-page "declaration" is literally packed with revelations like this, for instance: "Forty-eight years of an alien and hostile power have brought the country and people to the brink of catastrophe... The hour of supreme danger has struck for every thinking Estonian who is capable of a sense of responsibility... The Soviet type of social system has proven to be an impasse for human development... Our hands are tied not only by the power of the Communist Party, but also by a paralyzing sense of uncertainty and hopelessness... Estonian! do not be ashamed to be a nationalist..."

Were it not for two significant facts, it might not be worth taking seriously the nationalist aspirations of a handful of people (at present there are only about 200 people in the ENIP) who shower countless appeals and memorandums on international organizations and heads of Western governments calling for help and support. People like my interlocutor, people like Mati Kiyrend, Lagle Parek, Eve Pyarnaste, Vello Salum, Erik Udam, Sander Siss, and their other supporters are so very eager to pass themselves off as the spokesmen for national interests. They are not the only ones who have that desire today. Moreover they have something to argue about: Many ENIP members long ago developed "ideological differences" with Soviet laws. For instance, Sander Siss, who is none other than the would-be artist Aleksandr Kokin, twice had dealings with the courts long before becoming an ENIP member and joining its council—the first time in 1966 for petty theft, larceny, and unlawful possession of a firearm, and the second in 1976 after an attempt to unlawfully cross the state border.

Here is what is particularly alarming in this connection. On studying the Estonian press you cannot help noticing that some social movements supposedly formed in support of restructuring do not, for some reason, always find it necessary to indicate their principled stand with regard to the ENIP's plans. Why not? Do they not take it into account; do they not see it as a real political force? But is there not some ambiguity in this silence, which can only play into the hands of the ENIP functionaries, especially when, on some fundamental issues, their platforms coincide, if only superficially? After all, this very much suits the leaders of extremist movements. In the initial phase, small associations need allies or at least the potential for future alliances. But do progressive social associations need this "proximity"?

The question is not all that simple, if you take into account the fact that some of the popular front leaders (the artist Heynts Valk, for instance), far from condemning their intentions, actually call on people to respect the present-day separatists "for their boldness." "It takes courage to continue along that path knowing that what happened to the 'Karabakh' Committee could happen to you. Restructuring is all very well, but the power is in the hands of the bureaucracy," he told a SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA correspondent the other day. "Are slogans against the state system not anticonstitutional propaganda?" the journalist asked. "No, not anticonstitutional," Valk noted.

It is hardly surprising that today the ENIP supporters do not merely declare their aspirations. The aforementioned "declaration" clearly attempts to transform their ambitious political dreams into an open call for action. How else can one interpret the following passage, for instance: "We will have to win political, economic, and cultural sovereignty in practice. No outsider will make us a present of anything. The Communist Party will not give up anything voluntarily..."

History has shown repeatedly that any attempt to turn social forces aside from the path of socialism and change the people's historic choice begins according to a traditional pattern—with the revision of immutable values, idealization of the alternative social and economic system, shameless attempts to play on people's national feelings, and persistent ruses aimed at compromising and discrediting the party's role in one way or another.

Those who declare themselves to be the sole champions of the Estonian people's interests have tried to bring all these mechanisms into action to some degree today.

"Over the last 50 years the Estonian Communist Party has been unable to defend the Estonian people's interests," it says, for instance, in the "Proposal for Formation of the ENIP," which is basically its political program. "Until such time as the Estonian national state achieves autonomy again, the ENIP would defend the Estonian people's interests and act as a national opposition grouping to the Estonian Communist Party."

You could hardly put it more clearly. The priority tasks the homespun politicians would like to implement in the economic sphere in certain circumstances are formulated with equal frankness. They include, for instance, "the creation of free opportunities for private enterprise... and its expansion."

A number of documents exhaustively stipulate the conditions that would make it possible to carry out the desired "transformations" in the republic. To this end it is necessary, in particular, to seek the withdrawal of Soviet troops from the Estonian SSR and bring in instead—"to avoid coercion and repressions on the part of the Soviet occupying powers inspired by Moscow and the fifth column"—UN troops...

When you read and hear all these statements, which are formulated entirely seriously, when you try to analyze the absurd plans to eliminate the modern industrial base in the republic and stop working natural resources coupled with solemn promises to immediately improve the people's living standard, increase pensions and wages, and fill the market with shortage goods, you cannot help being struck by the "naivete" of their authors. No, not in connection with their wild economic schemes. Here it must be assumed that they themselves entertain no illusions. What is striking is the naivete of their hopes of finding people who are stupid enough today to believe seriously that only one thing prevents manna from heaven from falling on Estonian soil—the "diktat of outsiders," the Estonian SSR's membership in the united union of republics.

I have discussed all this many times with people who live and work in Tallinn or serve in the Baltic region.

"Such slogans are pure adventurism, an attempt to dupe people"—that is the belief of V. Liyv, lathe operators' team leader at the Tallinn excavator plant, Hero of Socialist Labor, member of the Estonian Communist Party Central Committee Bureau, and USSR Supreme Soviet deputy.

He is not alone in this assessment of the ENIP's activity.

"It is a manifestation of the extremes that have unfortunately surfaced on the wave of major changes in our society's life," says Major General V. Vare, retired, candidate deputy to the USSR Supreme Soviet from the All-Union Organization of War and Labor Veterans. "Both the political orientation and the objectives of the ENIP people are obvious."

"Frankly speaking," Major V. Brevyak, political work officer at the Tallinn garrison, says, "the passivity, the unjustified indulgence still displayed toward the ENIP is alarming."

I admit that after my assignment to Estonia it is hard not to share this concern. We must speak and write about extremism, lack of political sophistication, and unscrupulousness, without being afraid of indignant resolutions. No one must form the idea that the paths of emergent restructuring are straight and easy or that its opponents are mythical shadows, and that neither attentiveness nor efforts are needed to combat them. Socialist democracy, it must be clear to everyone, is not anarchy or permissiveness. It cannot and will not serve the adventurist aspirations of those who, under cover of pluralism, ignore the law, which protects the highest interests of the people and state.

Banned Latvian Church Magazine Returns to Print

LD2701203889 Vatican City International Service in German 1500 GMT 27 Jan 89

[Text] The Latvian church magazine KATOLU DZIVE [CATHOLIC LIFE], which has been banned since 1940, will be published again. The responsible authorities have permitted a print run of 30,000 copies. The issue of KATOLU DZIVE which will be out soon will be sequentially numbered from the last published in 1940.

Lithuania's Brzauskas on Draft Constitution

LD2701144289 Vilnius in English to North America 2300 GMT 25 Jan 89

[Text] The scientists from the Lithuanian Academy of Sciences have met the first secretary of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee, Algirdas Brzauskas, who is also the chairman of the Supreme Soviet commission for the republic's draft constitution.

He informed the scientists that the commission had concluded its work on the draft constitution and will advance it for public consideration.

Algirdas Brazauskas noted that Lithuania was the first union republic which had already prepared such a draft. The first secretary also answered the questions concerning those constitutional clauses which had prompted the concern of our society. Speaking on the republic's property, Algirdas Brazauskas said that the draft read as follows: The exclusive property of the Lithuanian state is earth, its riches, water, sea-shelf, and forests.

A lot of discussions and concern was caused by Clause 70. On that, Algirdas Brazauskas said that draft read that the laws of the Soviet Union and other decrees of the USSR supreme state authorities and organs of control were valid if they did not run against Lithuania's Constitution and did not violate its sovereign rights.

Formation of Baltic National Armies Viewed

PM2601112389 Vilnius SOVETSKAYA LITVA in Russian 13 Jan 89 p 4

[Lieutenant Colonel Z. Vichis article: "Should There Be National Army Formations?"; first paragraph is SOVETSKAYA LITVA introduction]

[Excerpts] On 23 December last year SOVETSKAYA LITVA published a letter from Colonel V. Kulpinskas under the headline "Where Should a Guy From Lithuania Serve." The editorial office received replies to this material expressing different opinions as to where young men from our republic should perform their military service. We offer one of them for your attention.

I think that, in itself, the demand to restore the Baltic republics' right to create territorial military formations, a right recognized by previous Soviet Constitutions, is not all that absurd. Let us recall the time when the Red Army was being created. Units of Lettish Red Riflemen were created at that time, with Latvians and Lithuanians, Estonians and Russians, Belorussians and Jews, and people of other nationalities serving in them. As for Lithuania, many people have probably already forgotten that back in 1940 the Lithuanian SSR had its own People's Commissariat for the Armed Forces, that other units were formed during the Great Patriotic War and existed until 1956.

There is another side to this question. How can the situation be described as normal when young men from the Baltic republics are sent to serve in the Transbaykal region or Central Asia, while young men from there are brought to the Baltic republics? How much does all this cost the state? Furthermore, not all of them withstand the changes in climatic, psychological, and moral pressures resulting from such a sharp change in their place of residence. In my view it would be more expedient if they were to perform their constitutional duty in their own or a neighboring district.

An objective analysis of today's situation shows that the time has come to back up the bombastic slogan to "Constantly Strengthen Friendship Between Peoples" with practical and truly international deeds. One constructive measure of fraternal comradeship could be the creation and restoration of military formations in every republic whose personnel would be made up mainly (but not completely) of representatives of the indigenous population. The setting up of such national formations would enhance responsibility for the performance of military service and would assist the cultivation of patriotic feelings; it would be a real school of internationalism. It is only through our national specific features that we can achieve true internationalism. This has been proved by mankind's existence.

It is therefore incorrect to opine that, if the Soviet Union were to be attacked, each republic with its own army would "sit on the fence" within its national borders disregarding the conflagration raging inside the common home. The absurdity of such claims is obvious. First, national formations would be subordinate to the USSR Ministry of Defense, and second, history knows of no occasion when the Baltic peoples have sat on the fence if Russia has been threatened by an enemy. Who would venture to name even a single occasion when the interests of the Baltic peoples were not identical with Russia's interests?

Take Lithuania, for example. Was it not Lithuania's Grand Prince Olgerd who, back in 1363, first routed Russia's bitter enemies, the Mongol-Tatar conquerors, far away from Lithuania near Siniye Vody? [passage omitted]

Pride in the exploits of our forebears, even if performed more than 6 centuries ago, is a source of patriotism because it is impossible to be a patriot today without relying on the fatherland's extremely rich past. Forgetting Lithuania's glorious historical personalities would be tantamount to the French renouncing Jeanne d'Arc, the Italians renouncing Garibaldi, or the Russians renouncing Dmitriy Donskoy. Nonetheless, until quite recently (and even now), some zealous "Soviet military leaders" of Lithuanian nationality continue to feel proud of the valor and selflessness displayed by soldiers from the 16th Lithuanian Division during the Great Patriotic War, while perceiving pride in the feats of Keystut and Vitovt [14th century Lithuanian grand princes] almost as a manifestation of nationalism similar to the nationalism of calls for the creation of Soviet national military formations. Who then, they ask, will serve in the North, in the Far East, and in other regions in the country and outside its borders whenever demanded by the interests of the motherland's defense and its security?

But nobody is presenting the question in this form. People recognize and realize the harsh reality: It is incumbent upon Soviet soldiers from the Baltic republics to perform their patriotic and international duty wherever our great common motherland sends them. But they must feel at home everywhere—be it in distant Chukotka, in the polar snows, or in the burning sands. And the best way to ensure this is to structure units according to the territorial principle.

Ultimately, however, it is not a matter of where territorial units will be stationed, be it Latvia, Estonia, or Georgia—it is a matter of how the soldier thinks and what he holds sacred. And service can become sacred and especially honorable in territorial formations. It might, for example, be possible to transfer to these units servicemen who have served a certain length of time in other units and districts and have earned this transfer through their military labor. Such formations would become the pride of union republics and our Armed Forces.

Lt Gen Kuzmin Identified as Baltic Commander

PM3101121789 [Editorial Report] Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 25 January 1989 First Edition carries on page 2 under the headline "Trust and Duty" a report by Major V. Zadubrovskiy on the nomination of candidate USSR people's deputies in Baltic military units. The report identifies Lieutenant General Fedor Mikhaylovich Kuzmin as commander of the Baltic Military District.

Ukraine Official on 'National Culture' Policy

AU3001100689 Kiev PRAVDA UKRAINY in Russian 20 Jan 89 p 2

[S. Ganichev-signed report on interview with L.M. Kravchuk, chief of the Ideological Department in the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee: "Dedicating Spiritual Powers to Restructuring"—place and date not given]

[Text] **Recently, the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee examined the issue "On the Progress Made in Implementing the Ukrainian Communist Party Central**

Committee Decision 'On Measures To Implement in the Republic the Directives of the 27th Party Congress and the January (1987) CPSU Central Committee in the Sphere of Ethnic Relations, and To Intensify the Internationalist and Patriotic Education of the Population.'" Our readers are very interested in the problems that are addressed in the decision. Evidence of this is to be found in the letters to the editor. The PRAVDA UKRAINY editorial board asked L.M. Kravchuk, chief of the Ideological Department in the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee, to answer some of the questions raised by the editorial board's mail.

[Question] Leonid Makarovich, the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee decision "On Measures To Implement in the Republic the Directives of the 27th Party Congress and the January (1987) CPSU Central Committee Plenum in the Sphere of Ethnic Relations, and To Intensify the Internationalist and Patriotic Education of the Population" was adopted in August 1987. What was it that made it necessary to go back to this issue? How was the present decision prepared?

[Kravchuk] The particular attention shown by the Central Committee to problems concerning interethnic relations was primarily the result of the complexity and acuteness acquired by these relations in recent times.

The work performed by public forces on these problems has increased and has become more purposeful. The way these forces responded to facts that defied the slogans about the situation in this sphere, facts that had become obvious under the conditions of glasnost, was at times not sound. Naturally enough, the Central Committee has to take all that into account. And the matter is not restricted to decisions alone. Let me tell you that in one way or another these problems are being analyzed at virtually every session of the Politburo and Secretariat. They are being discussed in connection with press publications, with various public manifestations, gatherings, and meetings, with preparations for and the holding of various social events, and so forth. What is more, they are not only being discussed. On every occasion party organs, leaders of ministries and departments receive specific commissions.

On the other hand, life today has become so dynamic that it is constantly presenting new elements and introducing changes into the conceptions and methods of work that seemed to be fixed. The period since August 1987 has been particularly remarkable for such dynamism.

For this reason it was essential not only to analyze the implementation of measures drawn up earlier, but also to look ahead and find new possibilities for settling problems that emanated from the new conceptions.

Certainly, in August 1987 we knew less than we know today. I would like to emphasize that this is not an exceptional situation. If we take a look at a larger slice of our lives, we can see how far have we moved forward since April 1985 when for the first time the party formulated the tasks for restructuring. We are being enriched and learning constantly. This fact is also reflected in this case.

Lastly, it is known that preparations are in progress for a CPSU Central Committee Plenum on the issue of improving interethnic relations. As far as I can see, it was highly important, for the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee as well, to analyze problems concerning interethnic relations in the republic at a level as high as the Politburo and in the light of preparations for the plenum, and to define work guidelines, including preparations for the CPSU and Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee plenums.

How was the document prepared?

As early as in October, groups of functionaries of Central Committee departments left for the field to study the progress made in implementing the previous decision and primarily the directives set out in the 19th all-union party conference resolution "On Interethnic Relations."

Together with local party organs, the groups gathered a lot of material. Analysis of this material has made it possible to draw some conclusions already and to make proposals and decisions. The Central Committee then held consultative meetings with representatives of wide circles of scientists and the creative intelligentsia. We were interested in their feelings, opinions, and points of view on a number of specific issues.

The draft document was closely examined by specialists, prestigious officials in party committees, and representatives of creative unions. They helped scientifically formulate the general political and specific theses of the document, which was then presented once again to a wide circle of competent figures who in one way or another represent public opinion with regard to these issues.

Representatives of scientific institutions and creative organizations and newspaper editors were invited to the Politburo session that discussed this issue for more than [figure illegible] hours. A commission was set up to examine the remarks and additional points made during the discussion, and it inserted into the final version of the document those of them that were approved. The decision was then published in the press.

Thus this document is not the product of armchair creativity. It is the synthesis of the results of continuous scrutiny and a wide range of opinions made public under the conditions of glasnost. And, of course, it does not limit any future interpretation of problems that will be submitted to the CPSU and Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee plenums for discussion.

[Question] The decision mentions a complete concept that is being elaborated for the development of the Ukrainian national culture. What is the essence of this and in what directions is it being elaborated?

[Kravchuk] It was no accident that this concept was fixed in the document. Of course, it would be incorrect to say that we lacked a line, a position on developing culture. There are the Leninist theses, as well as the decisions of the 27th party congress and the 19th all-union party conference. Besides, it goes without saying that culture is not something that develops without a steering wheel and sails. But it has become clear that each part of it is like an island in an archipelago, and not the mainland.

In addition, it has come to light that, in our interpretation of cultural development, not enough use had been made of the primary [kornevoy] historical background of culture. At some stage, nuances or even entire chunks of Ukrainian national culture were lost. The arteries carrying the life's blood that makes this culture unique and, consequently, gives it a chance to exist as an independent entity within one single whole proved to be narrowed or even clogged.

The ideas that were current before about correlation between what is national and what is international have proved to be oversimplified, too narrow. While placing emphasis on what is international, people sometimes tended to forget that it could not exist outside of, and apart from, what is national. After all, works of art, for example, win international recognition only when they spring from national soil.

Why was A. Dovzhenko able to create masterpieces of worldwide renown? Because in his creativity he was guided by the universally accepted comprehension of culture, while his heart was deeply rooted in its native Ukrainian soil, in the Ukrainian people. This is an absolutely essential condition for any creation to enter international culture.

In this way the complete concept for the development of the Ukrainian national culture involves defining the main guidelines for its development, while proceeding from its entire accumulated wealth, from its present level, and from the spiritual needs of the people.

I would like to emphasize that this concept is by no means oriented toward any isolation. On the contrary, it provides for mutual enrichment through cooperation with other national cultures of the USSR peoples and with universal culture and provides for the augmentation of the part of Ukrainian culture in the common treasury and, consequently, for the enhancement of its prestige and its role.

Generally speaking, the aim of this concept should be to make greater use of the spiritual powers and capacity of the Ukrainian people and of their cultural potential in order to accelerate all the processes of restructuring.

The decision makes it clear that the bodies entrusted with elaborating the concept for the development of Ukrainian national culture are the Ukrainian SSR Ministry of Culture and Academy of Sciences. In my opinion, regular information about the progress made in this important work in the press, on television, and radio would be very useful.

[Question] The decision mentions attempts by nationalist-minded political extremists to impose on the working people a point of view that contradicts internationalist ideology and the principles of socialism. What manifestations of this kind are meant in the decision?

[Kravchuk] The developing process of restructuring has revealed not only its adherents, but also those who dispute this socialist option. While profiteering from democracy and glasnost, the latter have increased their activities and have actually assumed anti-restructuring positions. This applies to the Ukrainian Helsinki Union and the Ukrainian Democratic Union. Let me tell you straight that these fine-sounding names do not reflect real forces. They represent small groups numbering literally only a few dozen people each. Moreover, the same people are active in different groups with various names. They use various methods to try to make themselves known. They write numerous "statutes," "declarations," "statements," and so forth, and reproduce and distribute typewritten or handwritten journals.

These "documents" are vague, imprecise, and rich in abstractions that give grounds for drawing various, even contradictory conclusions. A number of theses clearly contradict the USSR Constitution and go against the principles of socialism. They attack the Communist Party, call for the partition of the Soviet state, and try to discredit the Leninist nationality policy and foment ethnic dissension. In short, the leaders of these unions raise their hands against our system and party, against friendship and brotherhood among peoples.

Their true image is more accurately reflected in what they actually do. They declare their opposition to party and administrative organs, incite people to hold meetings, and present categorical demands. They have called for the followers of Petlyura [Ukrainian national leader during the revolution and civil war] and the nationalist troops and Hitlerite henchmen of the OUN-UPA [Organization of Ukrainian Nationalist, Ukrainian Insurgent Army] to be acquitted of the crimes they committed against the Ukrainian people.

Here is the most recent example. The Kiev branch of the Ukrainian Helsinki Union applied to the Shevchenkovskiy Rayispolkom of the city of Kiev to hold a meeting on the occasion of the anniversary of the so-called fourth manifesto proclaimed by the Ukrainian Central Council [Rada] that appealed "to free the Ukraine from the Bolsheviks and other invaders." In my opinion, the reader has the right to draw his own conclusions about the goals set by the "Helsinki Union."

Cynically and in defiance of historical facts the aktivists of this association intend to use the "blue-and-yellow flag and the trident" as their symbols. These symbols remind the Ukrainian people of the bloody pogroms carried out by Petlyura's followers and the crimes perpetrated on Soviet soil by the Bandera-ite gangsters.

It must be admitted that nationalist-minded people are skillful in disguising their objectives. Many of them are highly experienced in a long struggle against Soviet rule. In manipulating public consciousness, they might under certain conditions win support among politically naive and ideologically unstable people. Unfortunately, not all party committees are fully aware of this danger. Now and then, the committees simply lack the ability to work in the thick of the masses under the conditions of pluralistic opinions.

To sum up, I would like to emphasize that the position assumed by the party to organizations that are formed spontaneously is well known: to support those that aspire to help restructure, that stand on the socialist platform, and that express the interests of the people rather than the interests of some groups of aggrieved and misled individuals.

And no self-respecting authority can calmly watch those who try to upset it, and even less those who come out against socialism in public. This point is beyond dispute.

This is why it is so important to reveal the true, unveiled image of these unions and their leaders, and to energetically resist their attempts to draw into their orbit ill-informed and inexperienced citizens, particularly from the younger generation. The task confronting the Communists is to intensify resistance to ideas and acts whose purpose is to sow ethnic dissension, to artificially aggravate the nationality problem, and to lead people away from the path of transforming our society in a revolutionary manner.

[Question] The decision notes that ideological cadres sometimes lack initiative, knowledge, ability, and the skills to work under the conditions of socialist pluralism. Hence their indecision with regard to extremists and the inadequate response to distressing events in public life. What has to be done and what is being done to eliminate these shortcomings?

[Kravchuk] Indeed, it must be admitted that for many years our ideological cadres have been educated under hothouse conditions. Since glasnost did not exist, they lacked an outlet into the open ideological struggle against the adversary, whose moves the authorities either tried to overlook, or in respect of which they confined themselves to the application of administrative methods. In addition, these cadres have got used to acting only on directives from above and within the framework of these directives. But when the framework was lifted, their muscles proved to be flabby and their will weak. Dismay and passiveness came to light.

I would say that the work performed by some ideological aktivists is constrained even now by fear. Even when the restrictive and formal framework has been lifted or is being lifted, the "internal censor" continues to work. And so the question that bothers our propagandist is not so much what to say as how to refrain from saying too much for one's safety. True, sometimes he himself does not know where the safety limit is. So he is afraid—just in case. This can be explained. We still remember the time when people used to be promoted just for saying "yes" to everything what was recognized officially, when they knew how to avoid hot questions or, on the contrary, how they could get into a trouble just for a slip of the tongue, for a not very felicitous little word or a deviation from the established rule.

There is only one way out. It is necessary to shake off that fear and to get out of the torpor. Indeed, many propagandists, even if they are well prepared theoretically, still lack experience in political discussions, in a frank dialogue. But it is essential to attack courageously. After all, one cannot learn to swim without getting wet.

No doubt organized training is necessary, too. And here a great deal is being done. A seminar for ideological workers has been organized at the Higher Party School in Kiev. In addition to refreshing their knowledge, at the seminar students master modern methods of political education. Steps have also been taken by local party organizations.

It is highly important to provide ideological workers with modern theoretical knowledge and ideas. In this respect, work is in progress. For example, a document is being drafted to define many issues of principle involving the appraisal and reappraisal of various stages in the history of the Ukraine. The fact that these issues have not been discussed causes speculations that are frequently nationalist-minded. The Institute of the History of the Party under the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee is preparing a three-volume outline of the history of the Ukrainian Communist Party. New series of lessons have been issued on Marxist - Leninist philosophy, scientific Communism, political economy, and the history of the CPSU.

Certainly, all this makes it possible for our propagandists to intervene in even the most heated disputes.

However, it would be wrong to keep watching and waiting for a time when all handbooks are written, methodological aids developed, and monographs published. We have already noted the high dynamism of the present social processes. No handbook will be able to keep pace with this dynamism and provide replies to all questions that are emerging in life every hour of every day. But these questions agitate people. This is why we must try not to sit them out and to keep silent like a "wise" hermit. We must be ready to share our thoughts, doubts, and interpretations. And for this purpose it is essential, of course, to constantly take the pulse of life, to know about new ideas, to attentively follow party documents and to interpret them independently, to analyze and evaluate developments. Otherwise you not only will be trying to catch up with them, but also will be hopelessly behind them, and in this way you will not only be unable to lead people, but also will become an obstacle. It is obvious that an authentic ideological worker, a true Communist must not accept such a prospect.

[Question] The decision notes that many mass media are publishing materials that are not well thought-out and that distort historical truth, social and political events. What precautions have to be taken, in your opinion, to prevent this?

[Kravchuk] Let me just touch on a few aspects. On certain occasions, the way a particular figure is presented distorts an entire chapter of history. This is frequently the case because some editorial boards accept unquestioningly materials that are submitted by authors who are caught up in emotions and are not impartial. But any partiality leads away from truth, distorts the view of reality, and as a result, it leads one astray.

Moreover, in responding to the topic of the day, journalists and editorial boards are not always careful about developing their position and about presenting their point of view. But what does clarifying some specific aspects accomplish when, in doing this, some very important questions are left open, even without an indication of where an answer can be sought? It means leaving room for speculation and misinterpretations.

In my opinion, what matters most in this respect is qualification. Having placed (quite correctly!) the mass media in the front ranks of restructuring, we still have taken too little care in organizing, under the conditions of the socialist pluralism of opinions, a continuous creative scrutiny of published materials, that is of organizing the training of the mass media personnel in order to increase their responsibility. In this respect, we have much to do. It is not mere chance that the discussed document also draws the attention of Communist leaders and the editorial personnel to the need to more carefully prepare materials concerning nationality problems and to create an atmosphere suitable for strengthening internationalist unity, friendship, and brotherhood among Soviet peoples.

[Question] The decision evaluates the preparations for the CPSU and Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee plenums of issues concerning improvements in interethnic relations as a matter of high importance for all party committees and organizations, for every Communist. What is to be done in this respect?

[Kravchuk] We have included the continuing scrutiny of interethnic relations at all levels, including in various regions of the republic, into the preparations for the CPSU Central Committee Plenum. A great deal has to be done to organize discussions about the CPSU Central Committee theses that are to be published, to gather and accumulate the opinions, ideas, and proposals that will be voiced in party organizations, labor collectives, scientific institutions, and creative unions.

And of course, I would like to emphasize particularly that the matter must not be restricted to mere scrutiny, discussion, and making proposals. In comprehending our tasks, we have already reached a level at which we can and should take active steps in a number of directions. Everyone in his sector is able to do a great deal to settle immediate problems and to strengthen our internationalist brotherhood. And in this respect the aforesaid decision not only opens up a wide field for action, but openly calls on every Communist to take such action.

Turkmen Party Plenum on Elections, Restructuring

PM2701143389 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 27 Jan 89 Morning Edition p 6

[TASS report: "Plenum Held"]

[Text] Ashkhabad, 26 Jan—The Turkmen Communist Party Central Committee plenum held today discussed the question "On the Results of Reports and Elections in Republic Party Organizations and Tasks To Deepen Restructuring in Light of the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference Decisions."

S.A. Niyazov, first secretary of the Turkmen Communist Party Central Committee, and other speakers noted that the reports and elections held in the republic's party organizations have had an appreciable impact on the democratization of internal party life and on the growth of Communists' sociopolitical activity. Greater demands are being made on the leading bodies of those party organizations which are being slow to restructure the style and methods of their work. The need was underlined to increase the responsibility of party committees and organizations for solving the problems that have accumulated with regard to satisfying the vital needs and requirements of people living in the republic and overcoming shortfalls in the development of the social sphere.

The report-and-election campaign highlighted a number of party organizations' lack of experience of working in conditions of growing democracy and glasnost and their inability to conduct discussions, offer cogent, convincing arguments, and take criticism in the proper party spirit. Conservative attitudes, bureaucracy, and a callous approach to people are only slowly being overcome in party work. There are still some things to be done to provide ideological backing for the tasks of restructuring. There must be a radical improvement in moral education.

The expanding process of democratization and glasnost in the republic's political life is demonstrated by a question discussed at the plenum concerning elections to the position of Turkmen Communist Party Central Committee secretary, held on a competitive basis between two candidates.

The two contenders—N. Ashirov, first secretary of Tedzhenskiy party raykom, and B.M. Sakhatmuradov, first secretary of Karakumskiy party raykom—presented their programs to the plenum participants. After a comprehensive discussion of the nominations, B.M. Sakhatmuradov was elected secretary of the Turkmen Communist Party Central Committee by secret ballot.

Central Committee Secretary Elected

LD2801103489 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 27 Jan 89

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] At the Turkmen SSR Supreme Soviet session today there was a discussion on the republican council of ministers' report on the implementation of voters' instructions, critical comments and proposals from deputies, and decisions on their request. Speakers criticized several points, noting in particular that, in working on voters' instructions, the republican council of ministers is failing to ensure strict observance of union and republican legislation on drawing up specific measures to implement the instructions accepted for implementation, specifying stage by stage measures, time frames, and those responsible for executing the measures. The session heard and discussed a report on the work of the commission on public education and science of the Turkmen SSR Supreme Soviet.

On 26 January a plenum of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Turkmenia was held in Ashkhabad, at which there was an examination of the results of report-back meetings and elections in the republic party organizations and their tasks in deepening restructuring, in the light of the decisions of the 19th all-union party conference. The participants in the plenum also elected a secretary of the Communist Party of Turkmenia Central Committee.

[Begin recording; correspondent Babayev, identified by screen caption, speaks over video of meeting progress] This plenum has aroused unprecedented interest, for multicandidate [alternativnyy] elections have never been held at such a high level. Announcements of the forthcoming elections were published in two languages in the republican party newspapers, and not only the announcements, but also the candidates' programs. The authors of a multitude of letters and telegrams addressed to the Central Committee expressed their opinions on these, and expressed various wishes and suggestions. The task facing those taking part in the plenum is not an easy one. To whom is preference to be given, to Mukhamed Ashirov or Babas Sakhatmuradov? Who is to be entrusted with directing party policy in the agrarian, the leading, sector of Turkmenia's economy? The programs of both candidates look most attractive, and in a number of standpoints are very similar as is the biography of the candidates: both graduates from the Turkmen state agricultural institute Imeni Kalinnina. In addition, Ashirov has higher party education, while Sakhatmuradov has completed post graduate study. Recently both headed rayon party organizations, and the main thing is that they managed to do quite a lot in the rayons entrusted to them, especially in the social sphere. [video shows the two candidates seated in the front row an auditorium]

Behold the results: Sakhatmuradov won with a majority of only seven votes. The fact that he is a candidate of agricultural sciences perhaps played a certain role, for the recommendations of science are for the moment being introduced very slowly in the republic's agricultural production.

[Video shows Babayev speaking in foyer to B. Sakhatmuradov] Now that the command and injunction style is starting to become obsolete, how do you see the prospects for party direction of the republic's agrarian sector?

[Sakhatmuradov] The prospects for party direction of the agrarian sector lie, in my view, in transferring the center of gravity of all work to the masses, at the grassroots, in giving greater opportunities for work to the soviets and to the economic organs, and in getting the support of the mass information media for this work, so they more widely disseminate front ranking experience; more widely disseminate speeches in magazines, in newspapers, on television; and criticize and introduce front ranking experience. It is in this that I see the work of a party leader. [end recording]

Reporter in Minsk Gets Apology for False Charge

PM2601160589 Moscow TRUD in Russian 25 Jan 89 p 4

[Unattributed article: "Where the Rumors Came From: The Strange Actions of Belorussian Militiamen Toward a TRUD Correspondent"]

[Text] It was planned to hold a rally in Minsk to commemorate the victims of Stalinist repressions last 30 October, Belorussians' traditional day for remembering the dead. But it was banned by the authorities at the last moment.

However, news of the proposed rally was widespread in the city and it could not be ruled out that an attempt, albeit spontaneous, to hold it would nevertheless be made. In view of this, our own correspondent was naturally assigned to be at the scene of events and keep the editorial office posted. He drove himself to the

Moskovskoye Cemetery area that day in the editorial office car. Our correspondent was there, of course, merely as an observer and did not get involved in the events.

However, something unforeseen occurred. That evening two militiamen appeared at the car agency where the editorial office rents its car and told the management that the car had that day knocked down a woman, who was in a serious condition, but that the driver had disappeared from the scene of the accident. A former driver of ours was subsequently shown a photograph on which he was asked to "identify" Comrade Vaganov in a group of journalists. Thus the threat of being publicly charged with a crime hung, without any foundation, over an official representative of the editorial office, and rumors began to circulate in the city.

But the matter did not end there. On 2 November K.M. Platonov, republic deputy minister of internal affairs, made the following statement to a 1,500-strong meeting of the oblast ideological aktiv: "The highway patrol has recorded the presence in the area of the events of cars which have repeatedly traveled to places where citizens have congregated (the registration numbers of the vehicles, including that of the TRUD correspondent, and the names of other journalists were later given—editorial office). These people now state that they were there by chance." The conclusion drawn from the ambiguous "information" gathered was clear: The press had been involved in organizing disturbances. The aktiv participants informed their collectives likewise.

Since such serious charges began to spread in the republic at various levels the editorial representative assigned to Minsk met with Belorussian Internal Affairs Minister V.A. Piskarev and asked for an explanation and careful investigation of what had happened. However, no action was forthcoming from the minister, and the editorial office was forced to inform the Belorussian Communist Party Central Committee and USSR Internal Affairs Minister V.V. Bakatin about what had happened. A representative of the USSR MVD went to Minsk to check the facts.

The other day V.A. Pechennikov, secretary of the Belorussian Communist Party Central Committee, informed the editorial office in an official answer that the question of wrongful action by republic internal affairs organs personnel regarding the TRUD correspondent had been examined. "It has been established," the document goes on to say, "that K.M. Platonov, Belorussian deputy internal affairs minister, cited unverified information about Comrade Vaganov's involvement in the organization of the unsanctioned rally when he addressed the Minsk Oblast ideological aktiv conference. The question was examined at a session of the Belorussian MVD party committee on 21 December 1988, where Comrade Platonov acknowledged that his statement regarding the correspondent was in error and apologized. Comrade Platonov has been strictly reprimanded for his rashness and superficial assessment of the information concerning certain people's participation in the rally.

"The Belorussian MVD party committee also drew the attention of CPSU member Yu.A. Kuyantsev, deputy chief of the Belorussian MVD State Motor Vehicle Inspection Administration, and CPSU member I.I. Brankevich, deputy department chief in that administration, to the breach of professional ethics committed by militiamen in establishing the identity of the driver of the car assigned to the TRUD correspondent.

"On the instruction of the Belorussian MVD party committee Comrade Kuyantsev spoke on 27 December 1988 to the collective of Minsk Taxi Pool No 3, where the editorial office hires the vehicle, and explained that Comrade Vaganov had no involvement in the road accident.

"A decision has been taken to hold a meeting of personnel in MVD subunits to examine questions concerning the observance of professional ethics in their official activity by internal affairs organs personnel."

Well, we would like to believe that what was really manifested here was only a lack of standards on the part of certain workers rather than the esteemed republic ministry's general attitude to the press.

Church Services Resume in Belorussia

LD2601235689 Moscow TASS in English 2115 GMT 26 Jan 89

[Text] Grodno January 26 TASS—Divine services resumed at the Roman-Catholic Church in the Belorussian village of Trikeli after a 30-year interval.

"A decision by authorities to return the church to the Catholic religious community is another good deed of perestroyka and evidence of spiritual renewal of Soviet society," local priest Tadeush Lisovskiy told his parishioners during the first service.

Last year eight new Catholic parishes opened in villages of Grodno region. All of them were opened at the request of believers.

"Now the region boasts 74 Catholic and 77 Russian orthodox church communities", Aleksandr Lyskov, commissioner of the Council of Religious Affairs at the regional Soviet of People's Deputies, told TASS. "Prayer houses of Protestants and Muslims as well as a Russian Orthodox Church monastery are also in operation. Baptists, Pentacosts and Adventists of the 7th Day freely perform their rites in the Prineman area of Belorussia. In the recent past parishes there were headed by new clergymen, including six graduates from the Riga Catholic Theological Seminar. Many temples, for instance

Catholic churches in Grodno and Shchuchin, were renovated. As was the case in old times, now bell chimes at churches signal the start of services for believers."

Kuropaty Commission Chairman Interviewed

PM2601160389 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 26 Jan 89 Morning Edition p 1

[Interview with N. Mazay, deputy chairman of the Belorussian SSR Council of Ministers, chairman of the government commission on perpetuating the memory of the victims of the Kuropaty mass repressions, in Minsk by own correspondent M. Shimanskiy under the rubric "In the Republics' Governments": "In Memory of the Victims of Repressions"; first two paragraphs are IZVESTIYA introduction; date of interview not given]

[Text] The Belorussian Council of Ministers has adopted a resolution on perpetuating the memory of the victims of the mass repressions of 1937-1941 in the forest area of Kuropaty.

An IZVESTIYA correspondent met with N. Mazay, chairman of the government commission and deputy chairman of the Belorussian SSR Council of Ministers, and interviewed her.

Minsk—[Shimanskiy] Nina Nikolayevna, what is it proposed to do to perpetuate the memory of the people shot in Kuropaty?

[Mazay] It is planned to erect a monument. To this end the Belorussian SSR Ministry of Culture, the republic's Gosstroy, and the Minsk Gorispolkom in conjunction with the Belorussian architects' and artists' unions and the Belorussian republican division of the Soviet Culture Fund have been instructed to hold an open competition for a plan for the monument.

Our commission will continue work to establish the facts of the shooting of people in Kuropaty. The Belorussian Academy of Sciences Presidium should organize a comprehensive study of the causes and consequences of the mass repressions of the thirties, forties, and early fifties in Belorussia. The Belorussian Soviet Encyclopedia publishing house has been asked to prepare and produce a special memorial book.

[Shimanskiy] Is it possible to say today how many people were shot in Kuropaty? Who were they?

[Mazay] During an investigation of the Kuropaty forest area over about 30 hectares 510 presumed graves have been found. Whose remains rest here? Who was shot in Kuropaty? That is the main question which the commission has put to the investigation group. That is why the government commission has decided to carry out a selective exhumation of the graves. The digging has been carried out by the archeological method, enlisting the relevant specialists.

About 40 forensic examinations have been conducted. Some 3,080 different objects discovered in the graves have been sent for study. They include cartridge cases, bullets, clothing, and other objects. Comprehensive examinations were required. Some objects have been studied at the Belorussian Academy of Sciences with the aid of laser analysis. On average the remains of 50-60 people were discovered in each of the six opened graves. On the basis of available data it may be concluded that at least 30,000 citizens are buried in Kuropaty. At present there is no possibility of establishing their number more precisely. It is clear who shot the people in Kuropaty. It was the organs of the NKVD. So far it is difficult to ascertain the names of the dead and the specific people who carried out the sentences. Here too there are several reasons.

First, as yet we have been unable to find materials and documents relating to the events in Kuropaty in the archives of the Belorussian SSR Ministry of Justice, KGB, MVD, and Prosecutor's Office. Second, having familiarized ourselves with the practice of registering archive documents, including the documents of criminal cases involving those repressed in 1937-1941, we established that the NKVD organs had compiled no documents indicating the places where the shootings and burials were carried out.

Our commission took steps to find former workers of the republic's NKVD who took part at the time in the investigation of the cases of the so-called "enemies of the people." We studied the archive criminal cases of citizens rehabilitated in 1950-1960 and found over 40 names of such workers. It has been established that during the repressions many of them had criminal charges brought against them and were shot...

In brief, it is still early to finish this story. The investigation into the mass repressions in the forest terrain near Minsk has been resumed.

Moldavian Prosecutors on Ethnic Problems

PM2701103089 Kishinev SOVETSKAYA MOLDAVIYA in Russian 20 Jan 89 p 3

[Unattributed report: "At the Moldavian SSR Prosecutor's Office"]

[Text] The Moldavian SSR Prosecutor's Office collegium has examined the question of the implementation of legislation on ethnic equality and ethnic relations among citizens. It was noted that the measures being implemented by the party and state to improve economic, political, social, and cultural life and educate citizens in a spirit of Soviet patriotism and internationalism basically ensure the observance of the principles of the equality of citizens before the law regardless of national origin, as enshrined in Articles 34, 36, and 37 of the USSR Constitution and the corresponding articles of the Moldavian SSR Constitution.

The choice of a place of residence, the choice of a place of study or work, and the exercise of other civil rights and freedoms are guaranteed in daily life by all the institutions of soviet power and the socialist social system and are protected by the law. In recent years no crimes have been recorded involving violations of ethnic equality or chauvinist or nationalist manifestations. Violations of citizens' rights to use a particular language in the process of preliminary investigation and legal proceedings have been almost entirely eradicated.

However, an analysis of the situation shows that incidents arising from ethnic issues and instances of a disrespectful attitude toward people of a different nationality and neglect and underestimation of work to create conditions to ensure equal rights in the development of the culture and language of each of the nations, peoples, and ethnic groups living in the republic still occur.

Restructuring, democratization, and glasnost not only prompted a quite natural growth in people's national self-awareness, but also highlighted negative phenomena in the sphere of ethnic relations. At rallies held by informal associations, in debates, and in a number of articles in the republican press, in the course of the discussion of restructuring problems, there have often been mutual accusations of nationalism and chauvinism, while the causes of stagnation phenomena were reduced to mistakes in the sphere of ethnic relations. Demagogic, ill-considered conclusions were drawn that were interpreted as calls for ethnic strife. There are complaints about dismissals from work on ethnic grounds, and instances of citizens being insulted and even beaten up because of linguistic and ethnic differences have become more frequent. Instances of the desecration of graves and sites of national and religious burials and of the flags of the USSR and the Moldavian SSR have occurred. Certain extremist individuals put forward slogans concerning the revision of the republic's borders and call for Moldavian separation.

In this situation the law enforcement organs, including the prosecutor's offices in cities and rayons, do not always give a proper political and legal assessment of manifestations of national isolationism and chauvinism and fail to take preventive action against negative excesses. Prosecution workers collaborate poorly with local soviets, internal affairs and state security organs and the public. The prosecution service is staffed mainly by members of the indigenous population. Moldavians, for instance, make up some 70 percent of prosecutors. It was noted that many city and rayon prosecutors, because of their inadequate knowledge of regional history and culture and the language, avoid participating in publicizing the legal aspects of ethnic relations. Proper concern is not shown everywhere for creating the conditions for national-Russian and Russian-national bilingualism, and attention is not always devoted to legal education and practical legal work in the Moldavian, Gagauz, Bulgarian, and other national languages.

Legal measures and proceedings are applied patently inadequately to persons displaying national isolationism. Because of the superficial and sometimes bureaucratic, formal handling of citizens' complaints and statements, particularly with regard to disputes concerning work, the true motives for dismissals and the imposition of penalties are not always clarified and established and stories of possible crimes on ethnic grounds are not always checked.

The collegium required all subsidiary prosecution organs and the republican apparatus to step up supervision of the fulfillment of legislation ensuring citizens' equality and compliance with the principles of social justice and internationalism in ethnic relations. Proposals were submitted to the union organs on stepping up responsibility for actions that directly or indirectly undermine the peoples' friendship and cooperation. At the same time the collegium outlined measures to improve work on the selection and education of cadres in the light of the ethnic composition of the republic's population and the need to ensure national-Russian and Russian-national bilingualism in the conduct of proceedings.

Real steps have been taken to extend the functions of the languages of indigenous inhabitants. In the republican apparatus, in particular, courses for the study of the Moldavian language have been organized. The immutable right of all judicial, investigative, and prosecution organs to conduct proceedings both in Moldavian and in Russian was again stressed.

Bar on Entry to Norilsk 'By No Means Necessary'

PM2601143389 Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Jussian 24 Jan 89 p 4

[Reader's letter followed by own correspondent V. Pyrkh report under the rubric "Letter Prompts a Visit": "Norilsk 'Secrets'"]

[Excerpts] We have been living in Norilsk for several years, we have been round the whole country. Everywhere we are received like invited guests. But we cannot invite anyone back: Norilsk is a closed city.... It is even embarrassing in front of friends: So far from the border and yet it's a closed city! How does this tie in with our present times?

Mr and Mrs Qolyakov, Norilsk

Krasnoyarsk-Norilsk—[passage omitted] Only the old-timers remember those times when people were free to enter and leave their polar city, like almost all the others in the country. The wall which cut it off from "the mainland" appeared later. And when I wanted to know why it had been erected at all, senior comrades replied by going up to the map, craned their necks significantly, and... were amazed at my slow-wittedness. You can, they say, reach out from here and touch a potential enemy; submarines roam near Norilsk, finding out its secrets.

So, they really exist—Norilsk's "secrets." How can the fact be explained, for example, that in the number of divorces the people of Norilsk have long surpassed all other regions in the country? A year ago in the Norilsk industrial region for 100 marriages there were on average 65 divorces, and in Alnakh and Kayerkan out of every 100 families 85 and 94 respectively broke up. Sociologists have still not made an exhaustive assessment of this phenomenon, but we ourselves can explain some of the most obvious things. And this "something" is also connected with the features of entry into the closed city.

As a rule, to begin with one of the couple appears here—the husband. A year passes, then another, and he lives a solitary life like this in a hostel. Does such a system help to strengthen the family? I think not. [passage omitted]

I talked with the inhabitants of Norilsk—I wanted to know their opinions, their viewpoints. They were unanimous: The limitations which exist today are nothing but an anachronism, a relic of the "cold war." No one is arguing that state and military secrets need to be guarded. But for this it is by no means necessary to declare almost a third of Krasnoyarsk Kray a closed zone! [passage omitted]

[Yu. Smolov, chairman of Korilsk Gorispolkom] "Last year the competent organs had intended to open up our region—it is costly for the state to keep a border guard here. But we begged them to wait a little. Do you know how many people rush to join us here in the north? Can you imagine, 87 kg of meat per person per annum!"

You can imagine. The living conditions here are harsh, extreme. It is for this reason that the state spares neither effort nor means to create the necessary comforts for people. But it is hardly worth fearing that, when they find out about free entry to Norilsk, half the population will rush here for meat and butter. This is naive, to say the least—just think of the cost of a single flight! [passage omitted]

So I think: Shouldn't everything be put on a healthy, economic basis? If people are needed in the north, get an invitation, come and get a job and work. If not, then that's your business, but in that case don't count on assistance and support from the local authorities.

It is primarily people who stand to gain from this. But who benefits from all these Korilsk "secrets"? Only ministries and departments. They need to spend less on social needs, and it is easier to take away the profit being obtained at the enterprises. Unfortunately, ministries' plans do not cover indicators like broken families and orphaned children.

Kazakhstan Names New Housing Minister

LD2601164689 Alma-Ata Domestic Service in Kazakh 1500 GMT 25 Jan 89

[Text] The presidium of the Kazakh SSR Supreme Soviet has decreed to appoint Comrade (Gaziz Khalikov) as minister of the Kazakh SSR Housing and Municipal Service.

Journalist Considers Treatment of Former Leaders

PM2601151989 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 25 Jan 89 p 1

[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA journalist Yadviga Yuferova article under the rubric "Every Day in This Spot": "Gone, Gone..."]

[Excerpts] "Why do we often need dynamite when we return to our past? To leave the people without traditions is equivalent to commanding them to live without moral laws. Only we must not pretend that everything began after October 1917... For millennia people have been born, got married, and died, and people in families have always known what to do. Yet now the rayispolkom is ordering us to introduce rites into our life on days which they have decided... We have a lot of local bustle, but there are few sincere traditions that are common to the whole people, like the 9 May festival. As an atheist, I will not judge the Americans, but God most likely has nothing to with it when, as all presidents have done for 200 years in succession, they swear an oath on one and the same Bible before the U.S. chief justice. The tradition remains, despite all their Watergates. But how do we treat our leaders...?"

This letter from my personal correspondence, which began last year with a response to notes on the party apparatus, arrived the weekend that the whole world had been able to see pictures of the inauguration in Washington. [passage omitted]

An "organizational question," American-style: Ronald and Nancy Reagan have set out with a full set of honors for their ranch in California, from where they arrived in the U.S. capital 8 years ago. If they still wish to play a role in politics, society will not reject them, for a rich person in America always has the right to be heard.

But which of us was able to hear individual union pensioner Nikita Sergeyevich Khrushchev...? Today's reader insistently demands that we explain why Muravyev, first secretary of Kuybyshev party obkom, was released in connection with his retirement on pension. And what does the routine phrase "released in connection with a reassignment" mean? Promoted, demoted...? Someone's name appears in the newspapers every day, and then it is as though he has sunk into oblivion...

I recall an invisible censor who impeded me in preparing a profoundly frank conversation for KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA with Kirill Trofimovich Mazurov, a former member of the Politburo. He steered now my hand, now the hand of my interlocutor. When pensioner K.T. Mazurov arrived in Minsk for P.M. Masherov's funeral, the television contrived not to show him, and the newspapers not to mention him.... That is all in the past. The conversation was published without a single cut. K.T. Mazurov has a worthy destiny as chairman of the All-Union Council of War and Labor Veterans. April 1985 arrived in time....

Therefore it is extremely important that not only April but also the new political system in our rule-of-law state should start working more quickly and that we should not consider the end of the official career of a leader of any rank a failure but merely a complete change of occupation. We still have to move toward this. Particularly as we now elect our leaders for no more than two terms. What is to happen to us next is our eternal question. And to them—whose question is it...?

A popular aphorism among apparatchiks during the stagnation times ran as follows: What is important is not how someone goes but where he goes.

We go and move on, and we will move on and go. The system is now trying to give everyone a safe-conduct at a turning point in his destiny: cutback, promotion, retirement on pension. But what do you and I guarantee for people on whom we will never again depend?

Procurator General Answers Phone-in Questions

LD2801180789 [Editorial Report] Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 1100 GMT on 28 January broadcasts the first installment of a phone-in program hosted by commentator Boris Kondratov. His guest in the studio, USSR Procurator General Aleksandr Yakovlevich Sukharev, answers questions from listeners.

Asked why the crime rate was now rising after having fallen in recent years, Sukharev replies: 'Unfortunately, it must be said that after quite a considerable fall in crime over the 3 or 4 years coinciding with the start of restructuring—over those years the number of serious crimes fell by about 20 percent and the number of all crimes declined—over the past year or perhaps 18 months negative tendencies have been observed and these tendencies embrace a large number of regions of our country. Over the country as a whole, the crime level has increased by 4 percent and the most serious crimes, including murder, unfortunately, by around 10 percent, and some types, such as muggings and robberies, by up to 20 percent. In short, we have an objective and very lamentable process of increasing crime.

"I must state quite categorically that lately there has been a noticeable weakening in the fight against crime. What is at issue here? We have moved along the path of making our policy toward crime more humane, and this policy is absolutely correct because what we did for decades, relying on the force of administrative criminal punishment, produced no results apart from social difficulties in the form of the increase in criminal recidivism."

Sukharev says that more preventive measures should be carried out by society as a whole. "While conducting this policy, which is an absolutely correct one, we should not place society at risk. However, some of our administrative and legal bodies began to display, I must say it openly, not humaneness but liberalism with regard to certain types of crime. We now want to fundamentally sort out these processes." In the past, there was a certain bias toward the prosecution, whereas now the pendulum has swung the other way. Genuine balance is needed.

A listener asks why the procuracy does not respond publicly to newspaper criticisms of its officials. Sukharev replies that such criticism is always investigated and a response is sent to the press.

Sukharev agrees with a listener's suggestion that prisoners should contribute to the discussion on the new draft criminal law guidelines. He also agrees with another suggestion that new laws should be provisional at first, then amended in light of experience.

A listener asks what has happened to investigator (Glyan), who headed the investigation into the Churbanov case, in light of the subsequent criticism of his conduct. Sukharev says that criticism in such cases is almost inevitable. "As procurator general, I do not have any reliable data about violations of the law by the investigators who worked under the leadership of Comrade (Glyan). "He goes on: "In the USSR Procuracy, we are now drawing certain conclusions from the Churbanov case from the point of view of bringing more professionalism into our work. This is inevitable; we must draw certain lessons from every case, but what was done by the investigating group, and by Comrade (Glyan) personally, as leader, we assess very highly indeed."

Kondratov notes that he accompanied the investigators in Uzbekistan and that although they were in constant danger they did not use illegal methods. (Glyan) is now a candidate soviet deputy. Sukharev adds: "I do not want to give an opinion on the court sentence now. I am now studying all the material of the trial. I would like to call attention to your remark that his group is now reaching the top of the pyramid. I would simply like to recall that Usmankhodzhayev, former first secretary of the Uzbekistan party Central Committee, as well as the former chairman of the Uzbek SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, have been arrested. This is at quite a high level of the pyramid. So this case is now being concluded."

A listener suggests that more attention should be paid to making criminals materially responsible. Another listener asks in what specific ways the Procuracy has been affected by restructuring. Sukharev points out the reduction in the use of imprisonment as a measure of punishment and says that the Procuracy is taking on a more social role. The questioner says that the procedure for making complaints against the Procuracy is still too complicated and daunting. Sukharev agrees, but notes the large number of complaints received—37,000 to the central apparatus alone over the past month—and says that most could be resolved by other departments on the spot.

A complainant reports that customs restrictions on the export of consumer goods were due to come into force on 1 February, but that customs officers had been issued instructions to implement them in December, which led to unpleasant incidents at airports and borders. Sukharev replies that he knows nothing of the problem, but will investigate it.

A listener asks what measures have been taken in response to press articles criticizing various top Procuracy officials. Sukharev says that most of the critical articles in the press are justified, but journalists also make mistakes sometimes. Sukharev notes that while in office he has personally received more than 150 petitioners.

Asked about progress toward a single investigative apparatus, Sukharev says: "The issue was raised and resolved in principle at the political level, at the 19th party conference. We are now working on this issue at the legislative level. It is not such a simple matter. There is a proposal, which as procurator general I support, that an independent investigative apparatus should be set up, an investigative committee, removing it from subordination to, from under the roof of both the procurator general and the minister of internal affairs. However, a certain amount of time is needed for this. Therefore, to be realistic, it would be better in our present conditions—which are, as I stressed at the beginning, that crime has begun to increase—to set the creation of such an independent investigative apparatus as a goal for the future, but for the present to hand over a considerable proportions of the investigations undertaken by the Procuracy to the Ministry of Internal Affairs so as not to slow down the fight against crime. That is my current position. I hope that this question will be resolved in the first half of this year."

A listener asks: "What will happen to the dachas of Shchelokov [former minister of internal affairs, now dead, but implicated in the Churbanov trial] and others located on Nikulina Gora? Is the Procuracy taking up this matter?" Sukharev replies: "Well, I would like to say that no criminal case was brought against Shchelokov. As far as those people who were in the dock are concerned, the sentence included confiscation of property, naturally including all they had acquired and their dachas. That is the law. I must say with regard to Shchelokov's dacha that I simply do not know about it, whether there is one, what it is like. We have not taken the matter up because as procurator I examine issues connected with criminal investigations." He goes on to say that there are procedures that can be followed to pursue the matter.

Turning to the issue of the draft guidelines for criminal law, some listeners suggest extending the scope of the death penalty. Sukharev notes, in part: "We know from the history of jurisprudence in various countries that never has the abolition or the introduction of the death penalty had any significant affect on the number of murders committed in any particular country, including ours. These are authentic facts and must always be borne in mind."

Sukharev also replies to various listeners about individual cases.

A further installment of Sukharev's replies is to be broadcast by Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 1215 GMT on 30 January.

Academician Kudryavtsev Discusses Human Rights

PM2701141589 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 26 Jan 89 Morning Edition p 5

["Dialogue" with Academician V.N. Kudryavtsev, vice president of the USSR Academy of Sciences and director of the State and Law Institute, by IZVESTIYA Observer Yu. Feofanov: "Supremacy Of the Law"; date and place of interview not specified]

[Text] [Feofanov] M.S. Gorbachev's UN speech said that all states, despite their ideological differences, must now "jointly seek a path toward the supremacy of the general human idea." In my opinion, we have started to talk for the first time about the primacy of general human norms of law, morality, and politics over class norms. This is a kind of personal revolution for me, who "took" historical materialism and dialectical materialism under Stalin. But how does science treat this whole turnaround? It would be interesting to hear opinions associated primarily with the law here. For this is also linked with the creation of the rule-of-law state and with the movement away from declarations to reality in guaranteeing citizens' rights.

[Kudryavtsev] The recognition of general human values is extremely important for legal science and practice in both its internal and international aspects. For it is these values that closely unite the law with morality and fully revive terms such as conscience, justice, honor, dignity, and compassion. And in relations with other countries and peoples they serve as necessary elements of mutual understanding and trust and as instruments in building world peace worthy of our civilization.

General democratic legal gains and humane moral ideas took shape long before socialism. Let's trace the views of progressive thinkers of the past on just one question—the punishment of criminals and mercy toward them. Democritus: "He who educates with the arguments of reason is better than he who employs coercion." Montesquieu: "A good legislator will try not so much to chastise as to improve morals." Radishchev: "The purpose of punishment is not revenge but correction." Marat: It is not mildness of punishment but impunity of crimes that gives rise to the impotence of laws." V.I. Lenin: "It has long been said that the preventive effect of punishment depends not on its harshness but on its inexorability."

But what was our juridical reality like? Remember, for instance, the USSR Central Executive Committee resolution of 7 August 1932: theft punishable by execution; no amnesty. The resolution on cases of sabotage, arson, willful damage to machines, and other types of wrecking: The OGPU [United State Political Administration] must carry out repressions with particular severity. The resolution of 3 June 1934: Members of the family of a traitor to the motherland, even if unaware of the treachery, are to be deprived of their electoral rights and exiled to remote regions of Siberia. The resolution of 1 December 1934: Cases involving terrorist organizations are to be heard in their absence; no appeal against sentences or petitions for mercy allowed; sentence to be carried out immediately...

Those are examples from just 2 years alone! Yet similar practices continued for decades. The work to restore legality after the 20th party congress was not fully completed. Certainly even then ideas of humanism, mercy, and justice were considered alien to class-orientated politics. So they were not firmly established in the legal awareness of sufficiently broad strata of the population. This is graphically visible even now from certain letters that IZVESTIYA has received and that you have shown me. For instance, in connection with the discussion of the draft Fundamentals of Criminal Legislation.

[Feofanov] Citizens are concerned by the increase in the crime rate and they demand that the fight against crime be stepped up. They refer to other countries where organized crime is punished severely.

[Kudryavtsev] True. But stepping up the fight should not be reduced to increasing sanctions. For what happens, for instance, if we establish a maximum sentence of 10 years'—instead of 4 years'—imprisonment for extortion but then we detain and convict only 1 criminal in 10. The rest continue to engage in racketeering with impunity, extorting cooperative funds. Is this really stepping up the fight? The main thing is the inexorability of punishment, and for this you need professional detective work, effective investigation, and fair courts, not to mention firm order in production units, good accounting and monitoring, and intolerance of lawbreakers in labor collectives. You won't get good results without this package of measures and you'll have no choice but to put your trust once again in severe laws.

Unfortunately, these simple truths have still not been universally recognized.

[Feofanov] You referred to history and I remembered something. The two great revolutions of the late 18th century and the one of the early 20th century began with the proclamation of human rights, the rights of the citizen and of the people. I mean the American War of Independence, the great French Revolution, and our own. If we leave aside the social content of these revolutions, one can probably say that they are similar. If only on the basis of their adoption of declarations of rights. But in all three cases reality proved much grimmer than the slogans. What do you think, Vladimir Nikolayevich: Is there a pattern here?

[Kudryavtsev] You see, it is for historians to judge the reasons for such patterns. What I would like to say in this connection is this. Robespierre, that outstanding French revolutionary, said: "Revolution is the war of liberty against her enemies; constitution is the regime of victorious and peaceful liberty." The transition from revolutionary struggles to civil peace was very drawn out in our country. Even now we are still quite slow to free ourselves from the old dogmas. For the presumption of innocence was snubbed in the early eighties, just like the principles of the adversarial approach and the equality of the parties in a trial. The admission of the attorney to the preliminary investigation is being delayed. And, most inadmissibly of all, I think, the practice of "patching up holes" in the criminal code and other legislative acts on particular questions continues. At the same time clearly outmoded articles—for instance, on punishment for commercial mediation, which has long been part of daily economic activity—have not been repealed. Departmental lawmaking cannot be brought within a reasonable bounds...

[Feofanov] What is necessary for this?

[Kudryavtsev] In my opinion, the situation should change drastically after the election of the new Supreme Soviet, in which all legislative activity will be concentrated. Its Presidium will not publish decrees of a normative character. The creation of the Constitutional Oversight Committee, which is designed to keep an eye on observance of the country's fundamental law, is also important. Moreover, a statute is being prepared on departmental lawmaking procedure: All ministry and department normative acts are to be registered and checked by the Ministry of Justice from the viewpoint of their consonance with the law.

[Feofanov] These are clearly essential elements in a rule-of-law state. But what I would like to hear about is this. We emphasize that we are constructing a SOCIALIST rule-of-law state. At the same time we talk about the priority of general human values. Isn't there a contradiction here? Doesn't the concept of a SOCIALIST rule-of-law state and SOCIALIST legality enshrine a class priority? Doesn't this mean that our "inalienable" civil rights will be different from the rights of people in parliamentary democracies?

[Kudryavtsev] A rule-of-law state is based precisely on general human values: supremacy of the law, mutual responsibility of the state and citizens, guaranteed rights of the individual, and others. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights adopted by the United Nations in 1948, international human rights pacts, and other conventions and agreements in this sphere are of a universal character. All these documents, which are recognized by states of different socioeconomic natures, graphically confirm the fact that the world is multifaceted yet at the same time united.

Of course, every country also has its specific features in the human rights sphere. Socialist countries, for instance, deny the possibility of exploitation and prosecute for nationalism, chauvinism, and racial discrimination. Capitalist countries don't guarantee the right to work; unemployment is used as an element in the economic mechanism. In proclaiming a socialist rule-of-law state, we see its task as being to maintain, establish, and protect by legal means not only people's political rights but also their social rights; to affirm democracy, citizens' equality before the law, social justice in the interests of working people, humanism, and peace between the peoples. We are endeavoring to renew socialism without rejecting its principles but while affirming and developing them—we are seeking to completely eliminate all the former deformations and relics of administrative-edict methods of management. Man, his rights and freedoms should be at the center of state and social life. Hence our insistent desire to democratize all social practice, consistently implement people's power, glasnost, and the responsibility of all decisionmakers before citizens, develop independent principles in management, and boost the role of public organizations. We aren't shutting ourselves off from the outside world or from other countries' legal experience, for instance, in the sphere of defending the rights and freedom of the individual.

[Feofanov] When people talk about human rights, especially in the Western interpretation of the term, the usual range of "freedoms" arises straightaway: freedom of speech, freedom to hold demonstrations and rallies, freedom to choose one's place of residence, freedom to leave the country, and so on. This is explicable: It is these freedoms that were suppressed in our country with particular zeal. In my opinion, a breakthrough has been made here for the first time. But dissatisfaction has arisen straightaway: The right to demonstrate is restricted; the right to live where you like is linked with residence permits, and so on. Couldn't you, Vladimir Nikolayevich, describe the process of implementing constitutional rights and the objective or bureaucratic obstacles that are impeding it? Aren't there collisions here as a result of the contradictions between our domestic legislation and the universally recognized norms of international law?

[Kudryavtsev] In my opinion, we are still only starting to create reliable legal mechanisms to implement and defend citizens' rights. We are acting primarily by the "trial and error" method. Moreover, other countries have now begun to learn from our experience. At any rate that was my thought when I saw the Hungarian legislation on meetings and associations that was adopted recently: It is much better thought-out than ours.

As is well known, new and more democratic legislation on freedom of conscience, freedom of movement, and so on is to be prepared. Our country's participation in UN mechanisms monitoring human rights and also similar mechanisms in Europe (for instance, the International Court in the Hague) is expanding.

As for the correlation between domestic and international law, the draft Fundamentals of Criminal Legislation and the Law on Inventors' Activity that have been published for nationwide discussion definitely proceed on the basis of the priority of international norms. I read Article 63 of the latter: "If a USSR international treaty establishes different rules from those enshrined in Soviet legislation in the sphere of inventors' activity, the rules of the international treaty apply." I think that this is a good manifestation of the internationalization of legal relations. It fully corresponds with the documents of the recent CSCE Vienna meeting which stressed, in particular, the importance of deepening collaboration between states, including in the legal sphere.

Incidentally, the Vienna meeting—and herein lies its special significance—is probably the biggest step in the last few decades toward mutual understanding and consensus in such a delicate sphere as the humanitarian-legal sphere. One cannot fail to note one relationship here. The more fully questions of human rights and freedom of the individual are resolved in accordance with general human standards and norms in particular countries, including our own, the smaller the burden of mistrust, mutual recriminations, and suspicion that weighs on relations between states. On the other hand, the more favorable the international situation is and the thinner the ice of confrontation and mistrust is, the easier it is to resolve humanitarian-legal questions. The progress made at the Vienna meeting in the human rights sphere is direct confirmation of this. A few years ago accords like the Vienna accords would have been simply inconceivable.

[Feofanov] One last question. I know of your close contacts with lawyer friends from socialist countries. But what about capitalist states? Is there a "cold war" between you?

[Kudryavtsev] There never was a "cold war" between us even during the times of stagnation. Academician Marc Ansel, a prominent French lawyer, initiated permanent Soviet-French cooperation between scientists and lawyers 20 years ago. Then analogous ties took shape with British, U.S. West German, Japanese, Italian, and other colleagues from West and East. Moreover, these ties were not disturbed even when the political horizon was overcast. I think that this illustrates at least two points. First, the fact that despite their different social systems, lawyers really have common interests and in many respects a united understanding of problems. Second, the fact that people, wherever they may live, will always find mutual understanding if they proceed on the basis of the principles of benevolence, tolerance, and respect for different opinions and on the basis of the fact that no one can ever lay claim to ultimate truth.

Moscow MVD Official on Handling of Rallies

PM3101091489 Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 29 Jan 89 p 3

[Reply by V. Shalkov, chief of Moscow Gorispolkom Internal Affairs Administration Organization and Inspection Administration, to reader's letter under the rubric "You Asked": "Bypassing the Law"—first paragraph is reader's letter]

[Text] The press has reported on unauthorized rallies in Moscow. Who are their organizers and what aims do they pursue?

[Signed] V. Avdeyev, Serafimovichskiy Rayon, Volgograd Oblast.

V. Shalkov, chief of the Moscow Gorispolkom Internal Affairs Administration Organization and Inspection Administration, replies:

Unfortunately the Moscow militia has recently often had occasion not only to help with the conduct of meetings, rallies, street marches, and demonstrations, as prescribed in the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium Decree of 28 July 1988, but also to remind their organizers about unconditional compliance with the provisions of this decree. In particular we are forced to take measures with regard to persons belonging to various associations and groups that try to bypass existing legislation in organizing public demonstrations in busy squares and public gardens in the capital. This usually involves the violation of public order and disrupts the city's life. And the participants in these rallies and marches do not comply with elementary Soviet laws. Acts of hooliganism, provocation of the militia, shouting of anti-Soviet slogans, incitement of those present to resist representatives of the authorities—those are the things that often mark unauthorized demonstrations.

This applies first and foremost to the so-called "Democratic Union," whose members deny the role of the October Revolution, the gains of the socialist system in our country, and the party's leading role, come out against young people's serving in the Armed Forces, and slander state organs.

Thus on 10 December 1988, a day of nationwide mourning, the "Democratic Union" and certain other groupings tried to hold a rally in Pushkin Square. Placards of a patently provocative nature were unfurled. One of them, for instance, said: "Where is your guarantee that the disaster in Armenia is not a Soviet version of SDI?" In order to impose order the internal affairs organs were certainly forced to act resolutely and use the rights granted to them by the law.

But you should not think that all demonstrators make unacceptable demands. There are groups in Moscow today whose objectives are entirely justified. They advocate the more active resolution of ecological and urban construction problems, collect funds for a monument to the victims of the Stalinist repressions, and so forth. Naturally, no one has any ready formulas for these urgent issues. Democratic reality presupposes demonstrations and rallies as a form of dialogue. A respectful attitude toward every citizen on the part of the law enforcement organs and on the part of the citizen toward representatives of the authorities is important in this situation.

Official Zaslavskaya on Public Opinion Center

OW2801054389 [Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 0410 GMT on 19 January in its 10-minute "Restructuring Spotlight" program carries an interview with Academician T.I. Zaslavskaya, director of the All-Union Center for Public Opinion Studies of the AUCCTU and the USSR State Committee for Labor and Social Problems.

The program begins with shots of commentator Andrey Konstantinov asking passersby about what they know of the center's work. Video then cuts to Konstantinov interviewing Zaslavskaya in a study. Konstantinov says: "We have just seen these film clips. How would you assess them? Apparently, not everybody knows about the center's existence, and those who know are not aware of what the center does." Zaslavskaya replies: "I think one can maintain fairly confidently that people have a very poor idea of what public opinion polls are. And if, for example, an announcement was made in February that an All-Union Center for Public Opinion Studies was not being established, but a match factory was under construction, it is most unlikely that anybody would inquire in December: What has happened to the new matches? Nevertheless, public opinion studies in the modern world represent a huge branch of industry based on the highest technical foundation, on modern computer networks, and various kinds of duplicating equipment, and the task to establish this kind of center has arisen from nothing, from a blank spot, so to speak."

To Konstantinov's comment that previously there was possibly no interest in public opinion, Zaslavskaya says: "Of course, we had no interest. And this lack of interest was not coincidental by any means, I think, because nobody really wanted to know it. To know it was alarming, to be frank, and therefore in the social atmosphere of previous years, we could often hear arguments to the effect that all public opinion polls were bourgeois fabrications, falsifications, and so forth. Today, for restructuring and for the normal development of our society in general and for its democratic development, it is absolutely impossible to do without public opinion polls."

Konstantinov suggests that public opinion must be known before various measures are adopted, to which Zaslavskaya says: "Both before and after a measure, particularly if we did not get opinions in advance. In other words, the population's reaction is needed. A decision has been adopted. So what? Must it be ingenious? Is everybody pleased with it? No. So let us take a look at what has happened. Therefore, the study of public opinion now is of course an urgent necessity."

Video cuts to Konstantinov back in the streets talking to passersby, asking them about what organizations express the public's opinion. Some consider informal organizations to be the spokesmen of public opinion, others say it is the press, with the magazine "OGONEK" being mentioned. Cutting back to the interview, video shows Konstantinov asking Zaslavskaya about the degree to which the center is now able to get the corresponding information. Zaslavskaya says: "Well, in June, we had a conference to study attitudes towards the election of management leaders. It was a fairly interesting study carried out in Moscow, Novosibirsk, and Perm. We then had an express poll which was not planned, and was related to the subscriptions issue and restrictions. Public opinion was very agitated at the time, and we decided that we should give a quantitative assessment of this event. So we did a study."

Konstantinov then asks: "Unfortunately, so far, maybe it is public opinion that is being poorly publicized, or maybe it is the center itself? Zaslavskaya says: "No, I think it is an absolutely natural thing. A child is not born before 9 months; he does not begin walking sooner than another 9 months to a year. There is a natural process of formation of the center taking place, and the fact that our offspring has begun conducting polls before being born [laughs] is probably somewhat unnatural. Nevertheless, they are being carried out, and the first famous omnibus is being prepared. In modern countries, most public opinion studies are multilevel, in other words, one study covers several different topics. So far, ours have been on a single topic. We do not know how to carry out the ominbuses yet. But, the first one is already at the printers, the first extensive questionnaire addressing several topics at once and, as of 15 December [as heard], it will be sent to the field. So we firmly expect that, next year, it will be simply impossible not to see or notice our center.

"At present, this is quite natural. We have not stood up yet to our full height, and essentially, we could not, if you take into consideration the objective conditions under which we developed and what we had to start with."

Video pans to the right and shows Professor B.A. Grushin, first deputy director of the center and doctor of sciences, sitting next to Zaslavskaya. Grushin says: "That is the point. You have no idea, and apparently neither do our television viewers, of the entire range of difficulties. They were not ordinary or usual problems. Tatyana Ivanovna has already spoken about the absolute lack of personnel, specialists capable of conducting public opinion polls on a nationwide basis. You must understand that for 20 years sociology was persecuted. We are currently being forced to reap the fruit of that disreputable policy pursued regarding sociological sciences in our country. Some 90 percent of the people we have hired at the center have practically never engaged in public opinion tasks.

"Another side of the matter we had to face right away, and which very seriously slows down our work, is the fact that we have not been able to create a system of what I would call elastic relations with administrative organs which in one way or another take part in the establishment and functioning of our center. But, the most vivid and most unpleasant situation, one that was fully expected—but that does not make it any more pleasant—is the resistance of some administrative organs towards the establishment of branches of our center in their organizations."

Video again shows people in the streets expressing their view on whether or not public opinion is being taken into consideration when major decisions are adopted. Most responses are negative. Cutting back to the studio, video shows Grushin, who says: "Most of our potential customers cannot draw up an order. They have had no practice. They ask us for anything, anything you do will be interesting. We literally have nowhere to put people now. We have spent enormous sums of money. The AUCCTU has given us a lot of help in this, and gave us a huge foreign exchange advance to purchase equipment from abroad, and we are now receiving it day after day, yet we cannot put it anywhere, even in its cartons, not to mention unpack it."

After a brief exchange on prospects for improving the situation in which all try to speak at once, Zaslavskaya says: "Many organizations are seeking a way out of this situation. The AUCCTU leadership is very active in this. We need to find a place in Moscow. An enormous number of Soviet people and foreigners in very important positions come to us, so of course we need a building that would correspond with the name: All-Union Center for Public Opinion Studies. It is a very difficult task in Moscow.

"Another one of our first distressing impressions was also absolutely natural. It lies in the fact that, not only are the organs of administration not ready, but our population as well is completely unprepared for these studies."

More interviews in the streets follow, with passersby responding to questions about the nature of public opinion. Zaslavskaya is again shown. She says: "Complete unfamiliarity and a certain suspicion. In some cities, we had telephone calls to the militia about people walking around asking questions—who knows what they were asking about, particularly when it concerned the subscriptions issue and various political aspects—and in a number of cases we had this reticence. Besides, it is still very difficult to find the proper language. We have not yet found one that can be understood. Society is extremely heterogenous, to which must be added the problem of national languages. It is an all-union center after all. We must poll more than 100 nationalities in the USSR. This is the problem of translating questionnaires to another language and back. How many mistakes can arise? Will we understand opinions properly?

"Now, as far as return communications are concerned, this is our major function, because there is another problem we meet, an absence of public opinion." Asked if the center has a media outlet, Zaslavskaya says: "Our only specific outlet is the newspaper TRUD, which has given us a weekly column and monthly page. We cannot complain about the press, but television is very important so that we can speak face to face." In conclusion, Grushin notes that some 60 topics will be addressed in 1989, among them such interesting subjects as opinions on social justice and on interethnic relations.

*Education Council Chairman on Congress Results

WA18000434 Moscow ARGUMENTY I FAKTY in Russian No 3, 21-27 Jan 89 p 6

[Article by V. Karakovskiy: "Six percent of the State Budget for Education: the Congress of the Not Indifferent"]

[Text] The chairman selected at the congress of the All-Union Education Council, director of Moscow School #825, candidate of pedagogical sciences V. Karakovskiy comments on the summing up of the congress of people's education workers.

What can be entered on the credit side, what was satisfying? In the first place, we saw the over-all picture of the state system of people's education from kindergarten to higher educational institutions. Previous congresses have not produced such broad pictures.

Furthermore, the developmental strategy of the state system of education was examined in a new light, in the context of the idea of uninterrupted education.

The tendencies of democratization, humanism and pluralism, as well as the development of the creative individuality of the child, received the affirmation and support of the participants.

The congress also showed the enormous activity of the delegates, the burning interest in their work, the readiness to fight for their ideas. During the sections work, sometimes 20-30 peoples would line up wanting to use the "free microphone" to present their delegation's platform or their own proposals to the congress. In this, the congress differed sharply from the organized measures of the period of stagnation.

Now, even though it seems to me that what causes the delegates' dissatisfaction is a relative thing, what can be entered on the "debit" side?

In the first place, the gap between the global nature of the problems forwarded for discussion and today's hard reality for concrete kindergartens, school, vocational centers, technical schools and higher educational institutions. It was no accident that the delegates did not so much discuss the global issues as pour out their pain over unanswered questions accumulated over the years.

In addition, every delegation and many individual delegates arrived at the congress with their platforms, their mandates, creating the impression that they were concerned not so much with the state of the general system of education as with the advancement of their own platform and concepts. There were so many of them that the congress's editorial commission could not reflect the diversity of ideas to their fullest extent in the summary document. This, too, aroused dissatisfaction. In order not to lose any partial thought, and certainly not any principle position, much work lies ahead. The congress' documents are going to be worked over very seriously.

The problem of the national school is apparently a reflection of the general social situation in the country. Everyone saw that this is a most complex, pointed and immediate problem.

The problem of defending childhood: If we use to speak of the need to protect the child from the mean teacher, then now we have begun to talk more often about the need to defend the child from mean parents, even from mean mothers, as maternal brutality has become a social phenomenon.

The teacher's social status: It is the case that despite all the nice words spoken about teachers, in the ordinary consciousness they hold low prestige; many still consider them "second class workers." It was no accident that the delegates spoke of the fact that the teacher's salary, even with the raise, remains below the country's average salary.

Economic and financial provisions for education: The delegates demanded that the State Committee for People's Education take to the Supreme Soviet and the government the proposition to decisively reorient the USSR state budget for the sake of education and upbringing. Presently, as was said at the congress, only six percent of the state budget goes to educational needs, significantly less that in many developed countries.

A new public organ was created at the congress: the All-Union Council on Education. First, about its composition. It has one hundred people, selected, as far as I know, by the most democratic means from the congressional delegates by regions. No member of the Council is directly dependent upon the State Committee for People's Education.

Although the Council's status has still not been worked out, it can be said that as proposed, the Council will be a consulting organ. The State Committee for People's Education will seek its advice, and I think, no important decision can be made without consulting the Council.

And further. The Council is a sort of collective expert, as it will consist largely of practical workers, who bring in their own expertise in theoretical and practical decisions, developed by the teachers of the nation's system of people's education.

Finally, the Council will have the right to legislative initiatives; it can present propositions to the government, to the USSR Supreme Soviet.

*Committee Official on Outcome

WA18000415 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
24 Jan 89 p 3

[Article by F. Peregudov, first deputy chairman of the USSR State Committee for Public Education: "A Word from the Podium"]

[Text] Today many people are asking: What did the congress of pedagogues decide? In my view the most contradictory judgments—from recognition of the complete success of the congress to the confused question: "Why was it needed at all?"—are more evidence of changes. Yes, different times have come, and one wishes to believe that the display of "unanimity," the customary two-digit scale of evaluations of "yes" and "no" have departed forever into the past. Today in order to find a true evaluation one must turn to an analyis of public opinion. That the right to the truth is no longer determined by official position is one of the achievements of the restructuring.

The delegates had various attitudes toward the congress itself. Approximately half (51 percent) gave it a positive rating, 15 percent made no evaluation at all, and 34 percent were dissatisfied with its results. If one also takes into account the fact that 38 percent of the delegates came to the congress without firm views of the problem, wishing to make a decision at the congress itself, one can understand the alignment of forces, which also conditioned the course of the congress.

I shall try to single out the key results of its work. The congress made a fundamental choice: the future is with a democratic school which is centered around the pupil or student. I assume, although not everyone will agree with me, that even if there were no other results, this would be enough to assert that the congress successfully solved the major problem: What should education be? Should it be based on a pedagogy of cooperation or should it continue to be chained to authoritarian methods of training whcih compromise the human dignity of both the students and the teachers. This result did not come easily for the congress was not programmed for success.

Now, in conjunction with the public education agencies of the Union republics and the newly elected public agency, the All-Union Council, we shall have to complete the work on the drafts of the documents submitted at the conference, taking into account the remarks and suggestions that were received. Of the basic tasks I shall note the creation of a new edition of the fundmentals of legislation of the Union republics concerning public education and the draft of the USSR Law on Childhood. The high-level decisions also require a change in the social position of public education workers.

But our primary task is the creation of a state-social system of public education administration. I should like to express a couple of fundamental considerations concerning this.

If today we imagine—even if not completely—the structure and forms of the state sector of the new system of education administration, the social constituent is seen as much less. It seems to us that it should solve three problems: collective expert evaluation of the state of affairs and the correctness of the selection of the major goals—the development of public education, the formation of public opinion in support of the achievement of the coordinated goals, and evaluation of the degree of this achievement, that is, monitoring of the activity of the state apparatus.

Then it will be clear what we should actually expect from the regular All-Union congresses of pedagogues as well. It is the congress that will have to provide expert evaluation of the global goals of the development of public education. In turn, the committee, in keeping with the results of the congress, develops ways and means of achieving the goals that have been selected. Between congresses the collective expert evaluation of the ways and means of achieving the goals is provided by the All-Union Council on Public Education that is elected by the congress. But the participation of the public cannot be reduced simply to the All-Union Council. The future creative teachers' union is now already becoming a reality. Can we get along without social initiatives, without envisioning a place for them in the state-social system of public education? Of course not.

Mark Twain once noted: I only know how a thing should have been done when I complete it with a feeling that I have done my duty. I have the same feeling. You cannot replace the practice gained at the recently completed congress with any abstract reflections on this subject. Why am I writing about it? No only and not so much for a self-critical summing up of the results as in the interests of the future. The processes of democratization in our society are gathering speed. The new forms should be quite different. Let us think about this. If one recognizes the purpose of the congress as that stated above, the congress is primarily a representative selection of people for expert evaluation of a group of problems that were clearly determined during the preparation for the congress. Calculations show that of the 5 million pedagogues it was sufficient to select 2,000-2,500, and not twice this number as was the case, and to observe two conditions: the representative nature of the selection and the competence of each delegate!

I assume that the conference could and should be planned relying on a systematic study of public opinion. We must recognize that the congress included people who did not have their own position and did not represent the position of the people who elected them. According to the estimates of the delegates themselves, these people comprised more than a third of all of them.

The process of preparing for the congress should be regarded primarily as a search for worthy individuals. This could have been done with a referendum: questionnaires of public opinion and, from their results, the delegation of authorized representatives. Publicity is a guarantee of democratic procedures—without mass media this is impossible.

Let us say that the task of the election has been fulfilled. Here we encounter a more difficult one: giving each worthy individual the opportunity to express at the forum his attitude toward the problem under consideration; otherwise why have we gathered there? Here it is impossible to get by without informing each delegate of the position of his own opinion on the problem under consideration among all the rest of the opinions. The ideas of the majority will be voiced in the report, which cannot be said about unexpected and original judgments. It would be an unforgivable mistake to leave these out.

The importance of extreme viewpoints, if they are logically grounded, is that they manifest the dynamics of the event being studied and make it possible to judge the future.

Even with a three- or four-day forum only about 100 people can speak from the main podium. It is clear that a previously prepared list will not do. Of the 256 people who submitted notes requesting to speak, only 54 delegates and guests were given the floor at the congress. And there were just complaints, especially on the first day of the congress, that far from all who were given the opportunity to speak deserved it.

So one must be able to reveal those who are capable of speaking from the main podium, mainly people with open minds who do not share the general opinion or who have original thoughts. In the press center at the congress we examined the lists that had been written for the speeches of delegates at the conference and regularly updated them: the question of the turn of mind of the speakers was removed. But this is not enough, we must go further. It is clear that in the selection preference should be given to collective expert evluation. But who should be assigned to this? The presidium? The new approach also requires a principally different arrangement. If there is no longer any doubt about the approval of the majority and this is shown by a representative selection, this is the time to hear different viewpoints. And then either the majority will again be convinced of its own correctness or the irreproachable logic of the opponents will enlighten future opinion.

There is one guarantee that all ideas will be given their appropriate position: the possibility for anyone to use any of the parallel channels: the podium of the congress or section, a press conference, an interview, the submission of a written text, discussion in a group of interested people...

Of course, many questions still remain. This one, for example: whom is it expedient to elect to the working presidium. We intend to test out the new democratic procedures at the next conference—the expert evaluation on problems of restructuring education in the spring of this year in Leningrad. Here, as the congress has shown, we are at an extremely low level of organization of the search for collective decisions: we allow authoritarian administrative devices which irritate the audience, confusion because of the inability to do the work, and a desire to receive formal approval at whatever the cost, having "pushed" a prepared text of a resolution through the section.

Serious work is involved in the preparation of documents to be submitted to the congress and the analysis of the sociopolitical situation. It is important to be prompt in getting an idea of the arrangement of forces. All the informational materials—questionnaires, letters, complaints, published materials—should help to reveal beforehand the probable situations and the reactions to them. Obviously, it is necessary to have groups of authorized specialists for investigating situations and rapidly overcoming tense moments.

From our viewpoint it is unreasonable to break the time with delegates to the congress. They are the ones who must implement its decisions and at the same time inform us of the course of this implementation. And here the difficulties are especially great. The sad destiny of the most fruitful ideas requires a reinterpretation of the practice of introduction. The package of documents concerning the new school which is highly valued by the public, including the concept of secondary education, provisions concerning the secondary school, and public advice, should first of all be reinforced by new economic and legal mechanisms. We are aware that the old work experience that has come down to us over the years cannot be discarded in a single moment like a worn-out dress. We are faced with an extremely difficult struggle, and we shall not be successful without relying on mutual understanding and confidence mainly from the parents.

In the program of forthcoming changes for the school we shall devote special attention above all to experiments. Some of them have already proved themselves, such as training complexes—from the school and even the kindergarten to the VUZ and institute for increasing qualifications. Others require experimental sites—territorial testing grounds for introduction. I repeat again that we consider the mechanism of public monitoring of the school and collective expert evaluation, the first experience of which was the congress, to be already in effect, and the more force it gathers, the less the probability of repetition of past errors.

Of course the congress of pedagogues was not a model democratic forum. But the reproaches, even if they sometimes reminded one of the Brezhnev style of meetings for show, we accept only in part, for we are all children of our times. Democracy is an immense area of culture that is largely new to us. Up to this point we are still not very good at listening to and understanding others, whether they be standing next to us or speaking to us from the podium. We still have to understand our interdependency. They we shall be able to evaluate the congresses from the standpoint of militant actions: who has won and who has been defeated. The congress is collective creative labor for working out coordinated decisions, and it should leave one with a feeling of completion: this is what we have decided and this is what we shall do.

The level of culture of the pedagogues is especially important. If they learn democracy our society will also be democratic. The congress resolution gives a simple response to this: we intend to construct a democratic school. But to do this we must restructure ourselves.

*Two Hijacking Attempts Foiled, Punishment Urged

WA1800044 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 27 Jan 89 p 6

[Article by K. Boyko, chief of the Ukrainian MVD for Transport Political Department; M. Berezovskiy, instructor at the UkSSR MVD Press Buro; and F. Chernetskiy, IZVESTIYA correspondent: "Clash With 'Pirates'"]

[Text] A Tu-134 airplane flying the Archangel-Kiev-Odessa route on 20 January, having made a turn over the Black Sea, came in for a landing. At this time one of the passengers, seated in a rear seat, demanded through a stewardess that the crew change course for Bucharest or Israel, or else he would blow up the plane. The captain, Pilot First Class V. Muravyev, promised the unknown man that he would fulfill his demands after refueling at Odessa Airport.

After the landing, Militia Msgt V. Kunitskiy and Militia Sr Sgt V. Kharchenko went to the ramp to negotiate with the criminal. After going on board, V. Kunitskiy suggested that the passengers be let off the plane, while he would remain as a hostage. The unknown man agreed. Valeriy spent a long two hours as a hostage.

The arrested air 'pirate' turned out to be 36 year old N. Kotsyuban, who lives in Akhtyrka, Sumy Oblast. He is on the dispensary rolls in a psychiatric hospital.

The following day, in Ivano-Frankovsk, yet another attempt to seize an airplane was foiled. An An-24 flying from Ivano-Frankovsk to Kiev had just begun to taxi to the runway, when one of the passengers stood up, walked to the tail section of the aircraft, lit a homemade torch and demanded that the plane change course and fly out of the country. The plane stopped its takeoff run. The young man was seized with the help of a stewardess, T. Yantselovskaya, the passengers, and one of the pilots, who came to assist. In a minute the fire that had borken out in the airliner cabin was extinguished. Two passengers and the pilot received light burns.

The arrested man was an S. Zemskov. He is 34 years old and lives in Kopeysk, Chelyabinsk Oblast.

Criminal proceedings were also instituted in this instance.

From the editors: The court must have the last word in the above described incidents. But, in connection with the fact that attempts to steal airplanes are continuing, and information about this is now no secret, we wish to emphasize again that any actions associated with a threat to people's lives will not go unpunished, even if someone attempts to pass them off as an innocent "joke."

Correction to Implications of Churbanov Verdict

WA3101184689 The following correction pertains to the item headlined "*Legal Implications of Churbanov Verdict," published in the 27 January Soviet Union DAILY REPORT, page 78, column a: paragraph one, line one should read: The verdict concerning Yu. Churbanov and the... (adding dropped words "The verdict concerning").

Economic

Legal Inconsistency Seen Threatening Co-ops

PM3001122789 Moscow ARGUMENTY I FAKTY in Russian No 4, 28 Jan-3 Feb 89 (signed to press 26 Jan 89) p 3

[Letter from Doctor of Economic Sciences T. Koryagina: "Clarifications or Deviations?"]

[Text] The cooperative movement is under a cloud: The USSR Council of Ministers has adopted a resolution on the regulation of certain types of cooperative members' activity. Familiarization with this document provokes a serious thought: There is a definite conflict between the resolution and the USSR Law on the Cooperative System.

Let us look at the Law. The preamble to it enshrines two significant provisions: 1. "The Law... guarantees free choice of the forms of cooperative members' economic activity...." 2. "The Law guarantees... the independence of collective economic management and the independence of the cooperative in making decisions on the fulfillment of its statutory tasks...." Later on, Article 10 (Point 2) says that interference in the economic or other activity of the cooperative by state organs is not permitted.

I could mention a number of other articles of the Law on the Cooperative System which clearly reflect the cooperatives' rights to economic independence. These legislative norms are nullified by the second appendix to the government resolution listing the types of activity that cooperatives are entitled to conduct only on the basis of contracts concluded with enterprises engaging in their main types of activity.

How can this be correlated with the Law on the Cooperative System, which states that "the conclusion of contracts, including the choice of contract partners, is the exclusive right of the cooperative... Interference by state and cooperative organs of management and officials in establishing and implementing contractual relations between the cooperative and other enterprises, organizations, and citizens is not allowed" (Article 17, Point 3)?

And finally, the decision on the elaboration of the procedure and forms for the monitoring of cooperatives' activity by enterprises, organizations, and institutions with which cooperatives have contracts forming the basis of their work is a violation of the Law on the Cooperative System...

On this point, too, there is a norm of the Law (see, for example, Article 30) which provides that the functions of monitoring cooperatives' activity are to be performed only by soviets of people's deputies and other state organs to which the economic facilities (enterprises, organizations, and institutions of health, culture, and other sectors) do not belong. In other words, this item violates the principle of equal rights between cooperatives and state enterprises.

Finally, I must add that the new resolution deals a blow to the public's hopes of establishing a strong and independent cooperative sector. In its philosophical hue this is undoubtedly a step (perhaps several steps) backward. Who is going to invest resources in the cooperative system now; who is going to offer big loans and credits?

Many cooperatives are now going to be destroyed. Will they receive full compensation from the state for the economic harm resulting from the termination of their activity?

In my opinion, the authoritative arbiter with the ability to settle the imminent conflict could be the USSR Supreme Court, which ought to confirm or reject the juridical "legality" of the relevant provisions of the resolution.

---

*Economist on Deficit, First Year of Reform

WA1820015989 Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian No 4, 25 Jan 89 p 11

[Interview with Doctor of Economic Sciences O. Latsis, deputy chief editor of KOMMUNIST, by LITERATURNAYA GAZETA correspondent V. Moyev under the rubric "Restructuring: Step-By-Step": "Minus a Hundred Billion"]

[Text]

Out of a Spin and Into a Dive

[Moyev] Well, we have passed through the first year of the economic reform. What are the results?

[Latsis] What are the results if there hasn't been, and should not have been, any reform yet? After all, we have undertaken a "long" plan with a 3-year transitional period. Only a year has passed. Barely more than half of the industrial enterprises have been operating in the new way. Moreover, what kind of cost accounting is it without price reform? Wholesale trade has only just begun—it may be said that there is no cost accounting at all without it. Only in 1991 will we begin operating at full strength in the new way.

[Moyev] Wait and wait some more. Do we have enough patience, that is the question.

[Latsis] I understand. You say there has been a "rapid" version of the transition in reserve? True, there has been. The NEP [New Economic Policy] was put into effect in 1921 alone. But the conditions then were completely different.

[Moyev] About the NEP, by the way, I heard an amusing story recently. They had to abandon the NEP, they say—hold onto your chair!—in response to the workers' wishes, so to speak. They say that the majority of the population that had welcomed the sudden shift to the NEP changed their minds after they had tested the NEP. They say there were mass protests and disturbances. And nothing was left for the Stalinist leadership, which was responding to the voice of the people, but to put an end to the NEP... And now my question. Is there any mention in the sources of such disturbances and protests?

[Latsis] Of course not. This is fiction.

[Moyev] Fiction. But why? It comes out too cleverly. Economic reforms in socialist countries—in Yugoslavia, Hungary, and China, and now beginning here—have certainly led to increased differentiation in incomes. Hence the discord and human envy, and here—attention!—a fable about the NEP is most welcome: The incomes were overlapped in such a way, they say, that they had to leave cost accounting out of harm's way... A warning for the future with a reference to history, so to speak.

[Latsis] It is not true at all that differentiation of incomes is intensified under cost accounting conditions...

[Moyev] Allow me! Now you are really... What are you saying? Haven't you seen these brand-new villas in Budapest—either for a butcher or a grocer—that have sprung up as if from under the ground? Or don't you know what is taking place on the sly among those involved with the unpretentious cooperatives?

[Latsis] They are "laundering" ["otmyvayut"] capital? I know. But where has it come from when it has been stolen? Perhaps our home-grown millionaires who are now being judged have at times enriched themselves in a field of full cost accounting?... I categorically contend that it is not cost accounting, but the former administrative-command system that has abounded in opportunities and sources for social differentiation, especially for those who are not differentiated by what they earn.

Yes, with restructuring there will be more opportunities for social differentiation in accordance with what is earned, not as it was before. It used to be that you were welcome to work more, but earning more—don't try that. With restructuring, there will be more opportunities to earn, but less opportunities to steal.

[Moyev] No, you have not completely convinced me. I do not think you can brush aside the problems of differentiation so easily. But let us discuss this later. Now let us return to the reform.

[Latsis] In individual sections and as fragments, the effect of the new mechanism can already be observed in the rough. Now the main question is: does it work all the time? Is it providing incentive for enterprises to change their economic behavior? And the answer is unequivocal: yes, it works, and yes, it is providing incentive.

Let us take the case of "Uralmash" and how it rebelled when the ministry palmed off its power plan on it! Let us take the enterprises that used to be "on their backs"; they are being turned into cooperatives and are rapidly standing on their own feet. Another very significant fact: for the first time, contrary to custom, requisitions for equipment from kolkhozes and sovkhozes have crept down. They are learning how to save a ruble, and they do not want unneeded resources. But after all, they accumulated them without counting before.

Further, last year labor productivity began increasing more rapidly than public production for the first time. Since the year before last—for the first time in our history, on the whole—the number of people employed in the material area has begun decreasing.

In a word, economists are noting a number of positive trends, but these are only trends, although they are important ones. And close by you see major weak spots, and large disproportions.

[Moyev] And no common denominator?

[Latsis] If we wish, we can demonstrate with equal success what has become better and what has become worse. Let us see.

At the 19th party conference, Yuriy Bondarev compared our restructuring with an aircraft that has taken off without a known destination. Bondarev sees it that way; that is his affair. But in my view, another example would be more suitable if aviation is to be used.

When the country's present leadership took the wheel, our economy was like an aircraft that had already fallen into a spin. What has been the main result of the new policy? The aircraft was brought out of the spin. Controllability is being restored, it is responding to the controls, and engine thrust is increasing, so to speak. This is good.

But how do we recover from a spin? The aircraft must be put into a dive, first of all. And that is precisely what we are doing now, diving. That is, on one hand, there is a chance of levelling off in horizontal flight, and then climbing, but on the other hand... We are diving, and so we are continuing to descend. In this sense it has become worse than it was. We are lower, and there is next to nothing between us and the ground. And this is the question: Do we level off and begin climbing or do we crash?

Very disturbing. When you mentally extend the trajectory of the present dive and assume that our present reactions will be retained and that all the present resultant effects of all possible factors will remain, then it turns out that we crash sooner. Economic collapse. In order to prevent it, we must overcome the inertia of descent by not being afraid to take the most drastic measures.

[Moyev] Are you suggesting that the "slow" restructuring plan be replaced by a "fast" one?

[Latsis] No, I am not. It is important that the public realize the danger of full growth now. But more about the measures a little later.

Around an Empty Counter

[Moyev] Realize the danger... And isn't it really underneath everyone's nose? What is happening in our stores? Not a thing... Haven't you read "Ottepel" [The Thaw]? Erenburg's sarcasm about the stores of that time is delightful. He says that wherever you look there are crabs and more crabs. He should look now...

[Latsis] Yes, a sharp deterioration in the consumer market has become evident over the past year, although it has been coming closer and developing for a long time now. The population's monetary incomes have been increasing faster than planned, but the market for commodities has been replenished more slowly. Hence the full set of gentlemanly pleasures: shortages, lines, allocations by coupon, speculation, price increases, devaluation of money...

[Moyev] A report caught my eye. The All-Union NII [Scientific Research Institute] for Market Conditions and Demand is maintaining control of 211 groups of food products. And it turns out that only 23 of these 200 are obtained without difficulty. Nowhere! [as published] It is hard to speak just about shortages and irregularities. Something else is going on in trade.

You read that the output of commodities is increasing. These are statistics, but you have difficulty forcing yourself to believe them. For example, that the cooperatives are entirely to blame. They say that they are scraping out everything, meat for shashlik, zippers to sew "banany" [trousers], cassettes for recording, and so on and so forth. What do you say about this, by the way?

[Latsis] Nonsense. Over the past year all the output of all the cooperatives has amounted to less than 5 billion rubles. This is a small amount for the country's commodity turnover at present. When does a commodity disappear? Now and then we are let down by the usual notions here. It seems that in order for a commodity to be swept completely from counters we must give one and a half to two times less than what is required to the stores. Nothing of the sort. Specialists on market conditions point out that if you give just 5 percent less of a commodity to the trade than is needed for effective demand, the commodity is already disappearing.

[Moyev] With such a small deficiency in supply?... Then perhaps Viktor Rozov is right. It was he, if I recall correctly, who suggested somewhere that special credit be acquired abroad to buy the missing commodities in order to saturate the market.

[Latsis] I can say that according to Western estimates our foreign debts are within the internationally recognized limits of security. But obtaining further credit is risky. Here is another subject. We have had to reduce imports for the past 3 years; we have been economizing foreign exchange. And what, as it turned out, was cut back first of all? Manufactured consumer goods. Food deliveries did not suffer or suffered less, but we retrieved our losses in consumer goods. The result: savings in the importation of a group of consumer goods in the 1985-1987 period yielded hundreds of millions of rubles in convertible currency, and because of reduced deliveries of them for the trade, budget receipts were short 8.2 billion rubles.

[Moyev] It seems there is even a special concept—the budgetary efficiency of imports.

[Latsis] There is a concept, but no efficiency. For budgetary efficiency, we must ship out what costs less here and is more expensive there; on the other hand, we must import what is cheaper there and more expensive here.

What do we do? Import color televisions, video recorders, and personal computers—household electronic equipment that is relatively inexpensive there, for which people here are ready to pay a great deal of money. No! We buy grain (it is common knowledge that grain is relatively more expensive abroad), feed it to our cows, and provide meat for the domestic market that is relatively inexpensive. We even allocate a subsidy from the state for this meat. Where is the budgetary efficiency?

[Moyev] I am guessing where the conversation is leading. Foodstuffs are inexpensive and manufactured goods are expensive, and by carrying out a structural reform of prices to make up for this we move ahead to market equilibrium.

[Latsis] You did not guess correctly.

[Moyev] Really?

[Latsis] A year to a year-and-a-half ago I was in fact writing and insisting on this. Even now I believe that a structural reform of prices is necessary. Only before it was both necessary and possible; now it is necessary and impossible. I hope that we will still get to the point where it will once again become possible, but for now the moment has passed. The structural imbalance has become a part of the overall imbalance. The market is affected by a more serious illness. Empty shelves are a sign of a deeper ailment, not only in the consumers' market, but in our financial system as a whole. The accumulation of unused money is approaching very dangerous dimensions.

[Moyev] One moment! I do not take exception. Inflation, of course, is under way and increasing, and we face that truth squarely. All the same, some kind of phantom or rebus keeps appearing to me here. The people, they say, have plenty of money, and the increase in incomes—so they write—has gone out of control. All right. But I am speaking from experience here, and I see friends, colleagues, and neighbors who would very much like to see their purses at the bursting point.

[Latsis] I look around and I do not see this very much. Not among the people—there is a great deal of money in the market. But the people, as always, do not have enough.

We have this persistent stereotype. We must watch the correlation between the money and the commodities. And we believe, as in holy writ, that a general-purpose stamp will show us everything—the proportions of the increase in labor productivity and wages. If productivity increases more rapidly, then everything is in order. As if outstripping labor productivity bakes the bread. None of this!

Here we turned about in the Kara-Bogaz [Gulf of Kara-Bogaz-Gol]. At first we partitioned it off with a dam, then we took it away. Now tell me, how is it important which increased more rapidly in this worthless fuss—labor productivity or wages? What is the use of high productivity if you do not produce a commodity but produce a noncommodity—for example, tractors made in Cheboksary which customers refuse to buy?

We have plenty of this kind of noncommodity, unfortunately, and the structure of the economy from the viewpoint of the market's interests is inefficient. Here is a clue to the phantom you were talking about: People receive their pay and think they are short of money... But then they bring their small amount of money to the marketplace—O ho!—there is a large surplus of money there. Everyone wants to buy a commodity, but not everyone has produced a commodity.

It is important to understand that this is also the underlying reason for what is taking place in today's consumer market. Commerce is being peddled, and consumer demand that is not satisfied leads to fury that is brought down upon the market with such blows that neither its force nor its direction can be foreseen. Everything may turn out to be in short supply at the same time. But I maintain that one thing is decisive: the state budget deficit.

The Sensation That Was Not Noticed

There is a surprising paradox in our glasnost. There is a great deal of news—interesting, unusual news of all kinds. A deafening clamor of information is being generated. It is difficult to separate the entertaining trivia from the important facts.

The foreign press—the serious press, of course—has not been caught napping here. They uncovered our important economic news recently. "A state budget deficit was announced for the first time in the Soviet Union." "Soviet economists acknowledged a fact that had been carefully concealed before. The Supreme Soviet approved the state budget for 1989 with a multibillion deficit." This was completely unnoticed here.

[Moyev] Is that right?

[Latsis] It's a fact. We did not observe this in the press. What was the main sensation in the Supreme Soviet session, according to the newspapers? Several deputies voted against adoption of the decree on the powers of the internal security forces. But the deficit was mentioned only in passing. The same thing happened in the Supreme Soviet. Someone asked the minister of finance: Tell us, dear comrade, he said, what does this mean? If there was a deficit before, why did you remain silent? If it has developed now, why so suddenly?

[Moyev] But in reality?

[Latsis] This is a special subject. I recall two facts that were cited in M.S. Gorbachev's meeting with scientific and cultural workers. The decline in world prices for oil in recent years reduced our revenue by 37 billion rubles. We came up short another 49 billion with the decline in wine and vodka sales. I will add that Chernobyl cost 8 billion...

These are details for illustration. But the minister of finance began playing down the unpleasant news at the session. He referred to the deficit total as 36 billion rubles (the session later reduced it to 35), although in reality the deficit is about 100 billion rubles. This estimate was made by our economists independently of the Ministry of Finance even before the session, and it was also made by Western specialists. But the main point is that this follows from the report by B.I. Gostev himself. He frankly announced a deficit of 36 billion and at the same time included 63.4 billion rubles borrowed from the loan fund in the budget revenues, the same source from which the deficit is being financed. What is the reason for such subterfuges?

[Moyev] I don't think I understand a state in which our informed international affairs specialists would not have proclaimed that the budget is in deficit and incurably ill. The United States—their deficit has sent them directly to the grave; but it doesn't matter, they are still surviving...

[Latsis] No two deficits are alike. There are calculations, and world practice confirms this as well, that a deficit within 3 percent of gross national product is permissible for a growing, developing economy. For us this would mean on the order of 25 billion rubles. Compared with this, 35 billion is not terrible, but 100... This is 11 or 12 percent, quite another matter.

[Moyev] And in the United States?

[Latsis] It is a little over 4 percent there. That is, the deficit is relatively much smaller, first of all. The dollar, in the second place, is a convertible currency, and other countries buy the extra dollars; but there is no one except us to buy our surplus rubles. Finally, the dollar is a world currency; the United States' position in global economic relations is such that others pay for their deficit to a significant extent.

[Moyev] And generally speaking, are there states outside the socialist world with a deficit as large as ours—that is, 11 to 12 percent?

[Latsis] None of the major economically developed states. Israel has a large deficit, but the Americans are paying directly for it. Argentina and Brazil stand out; the deficit there is on the order of 7 percent. And as usual, there is galloping inflation in both countries and prices rise not by tens, but hundreds of percentage points per year.

[Moyev] All right, let us continue. We must normalize the budget....

[Latsis] The first thing lying on the surface: If you have many expenses, look for revenue, and produce a few more goods. The Supreme Soviet session did some work on this. It said: Produce consumer goods valued at 18.9 billion rubles in addition to the plan, even if heavy industry provides consumer goods and the defense industry provides them as well. On the whole, a considerable sum... But when minus 100 billion... We cannot resolve the problem quickly by operating only in this way, by only increasing receipts. But there is no time to waste if we do not want the aircraft to crash to the ground.

Something else is left: Reduce budget expenditures. This can be done quickly, and there are huge resources here.

Here are the figures we will be reading before long in the annual economic review in the second issue of our journal. This year the plan is to increase budget allocations by 51.1 billion rubles. The increase in expenditures for capital construction is particularly high. Last year we began introducing proper order and froze construction of projects with an overall cost of 24.2 billion rubles. But with the other hand we ourselves gave our blessing to new construction costing 59.1 billion rubles. This is the way we operate at present.

There is no mention of reducing expenditures in the social area—to build housing, schools, and so forth. The discussion centers only on the fact that the state budget is overloaded with investments to develop production. You will not see such a situation anywhere in the world. And the time has come to define the state budget's sphere of activity in a new way, to fundamentally revise the mechanism for financing large-scale economic projects. Capital investments in production at the cost of the state should be the exception, not the rule.

This is not only the key to normalization of finances; there is a question of principle here, generally speaking. We are carrying out a reform based on full cost accounting. It is the basic foundation. And at the same time, we are continuing to hand out hundreds of billions of rubles—irretrievably and without compensation—to ministries and departments. Frequently, the larger the project, the more imprudent it is. Series of power stations, man-made seas, river bends, dams and canals... Billions are literally being buried in the ground. And we have already mentioned how these worthless efforts affect the consumer market.

[Moyev] Gaydar and Yaroshenko had a very keen eye in KOMMUNIST: They say that Andrey Platonov was brilliant to discover our economic system's craze for "foundation pits." And here is what V. Bogachev, an economist and doctor of sciences, writes about this, and I quote: "The Ministry of Land Reclamation and Water Resources and the Ministry of Power and Electrification are competing in the area of hydroelectric power construction in the search for senselessly wasteful projects, because the movement of soil and the pouring of concrete utilize the maximum number of millions in a unit of time..." However, I now have three questions.

First: It has always been considered our socialist advantage that the state is able to finance large projects in a centralized manner, isn't that right?

[Latsis] This is a universal idea, not a specifically socialist one. As a universal concept it is correct. The point is the execution—how are they to be centralized?

In my view, we must implement the idea expressed at the 19th party conference by A. Aydak, chairman of the Chuvash Kolkhoz. Building canals? By all means. Only not at public expense. Obtain an order (and money!) from a kolkhoz or a sovkhoz. You say the canal is for a thousand farms? Wonderful! What is preventing them from establishing a joint-stock company, let us say, or asking for credits at a state bank? Only do not finance operations with money free of charge through contracting ministries. The customer should have the money; it should be taken from his income, his material assets. Then the state budget will throw off its burden and capital investments will come under real control.

[Moyev] The second question. Separate the construction organizations from the budget. They are cumbersome! There are nearly 2 million employees in the Ministry of Land Reclamation and Water Resources alone. Won't they be left without work, without wages?

[Latsis] Why not? After all, people, the labor force, and construction capacities—they are also in acute deficit. Hint that there are capacities available and they will seize them with both hands. And what will be built will be what is needed for the farms, what they are prepared to pay, and what they cannot find construction workers for now, at least for roads.

[Moyev] The third question. You seized particularly on rapid measures. However, the budget for the current year has been made up and voted on by the Supreme Soviet. But the next one—is it in a year?

[Latsis] The point is that there is no time extension. I reiterate—we must realize the extent of the danger. We probably could not stand another year in the consumer market like the last one. We cannot shift the solution to the 1990 budget. We must reduce budget expenditures sharply and ruthlessly right now. I will not venture to judge how this is to be legally accomplished—by which session or decision, but there is nowhere to set it aside. Further accumulation of surplus money threatens chaos.

This is not just the opinion of economists. It is well known from materials on the meeting with scientific and cultural workers that the situation that has developed has been carefully discussed in detail in the Politburo. But I am not saying this to calm the readers—the Politburo knows everything and will do everything, they say. An economic system of a different type—not a paper one, but a real one—cannot be be implemented without the conscious participation of millions of people. We must all act together. The fate of restructuring has now been staked.

Vice Premier Batalin Views Construction Reform

PM3001142289 London MORNING STAR in English 30 Jan 89 p 6

[Report on interview with Soviet Vice Premier and State Construction Committee Chairman Yuriy Batalin by Kate Clark: "On the Road to Reconstruction"—date, place of interview not given]

[Text] Construction in the Soviet Union, like every other industry, is undergoing its own restructuring, and trying out new methods for greater efficiency.

Soviet builders are working to provide every single Soviet family with a flat or house of their own by the year 2000.

This target was agreed at the Soviet Communist Party's 27th Congress nearly three years ago, and building rates have speeded up over that period.

"The increase in housebuilding in the two years 1986 to 1988 was greater than over the preceding 15 years," says Yuriy Batalin.

But this is not the case everywhere, as party and government resolutions about the inefficient or incompetent work of some local authorities show.

In the past the Soviet construction industry has been criticised for its slow building rates.

The new lease contract, where groups of workers sign a contract leasing a works, workshop, or even a part of a workshop to them for a period of years has been introduced to speed up building rates.

Cooperatives, though so far there are not many of these in the construction industry, have also been seen as a way of increasing production.

The State Construction Committee, its chairman explains, deals with scientific and technological progress and the improvement of managerial and economic processes.

The committee existed before perestroyka, "but it used to come in for fierce criticism," Mr Batalin says, "since it cared little about technological advances or economic reforms."

Perestroyka, has seen the committee's staff sharply reduced, and the new committee now has more responsibilities, such as solving disputes between any of the several construction ministries and regional building concerns and trusts.

The national ministries dealing with specialised construction, like roads, railways, ports and so on, are essential, Yuriy Batalin argues, and will be kept in the future.

But the staffing of national ministries has been substantially cut, and many functions transferred to the republics and regions.

As building concerns in the regions become stronger, the national ministries' roles will start to diminish.

The four construction ministries which at present exist in the largest Soviet republic, the Russian Federation, may in time be transformed into associations, explains Mr Batalin.

"There are plenty of ideas, but it is difficult to predict what will happen. But without any doubt the present system will change."

Already, Mr Batalin says, in republics or regions where capital construction is quite healthy, less use is made of the State Construction Committee.

Yuriy Batalin is a firm believer in the need to develop new methods for organising labour, like the cooperatives and lease contract arrangements in the building industry.

The cooperatives that have been set up, mainly at factories producing building materials, only account for some 2 percent of production. In construction itself, cooperatives only account for under 1 percent.

But Mr Batalin intends to make the introduction of lease and cooperative forms of production a priority for 1989, and anticipates that up to 40 percent of construction concerns will be leased out to their workers by the end of the year.

"Theoretically it is not yet clear which workforce is a cooperative and which is a lease collective," Mr Batalin says. "My opinion, however, is that with time these distinctions will disappear."

Mr Batalin admits that the activity of some of the cooperatives formed in the last few years have caused concern.

Their high prices sometimes reflect a get-rich-quick mentality.

"Under lease contracts, a collective makes certain undertakings as regards the variety and quality of what it will produce," explains Yuriy Batalin. "I prefer lease arrangements, where cooperative forms of organising production are used but where state ownership is preserved."

It is the workers themselves who are in charge of complying with the terms of the lease contract, and it is they who determine what to do with any profits.

"I don't think that there is any reason to claim that lease forms will cultivate feelings of private ownership," says Mr Batalin.

"What we are more afraid of is that the workers in their rush for bigger profits and wages might not use their factories properly.

"They might neglect the more long-term needs, like technological innovation and development."

The lease workforce pays for running costs, general repairs and minor reconstruction of their workplace, while state investment is available for major renovation or repairs.

At present it is mainly loss-making factories which are going over to lease contracts.

The State Construction Committee is also encouraging lease forms in factories with low profitability, to get them on to a fully self-supporting basis.

"Of course, when the whole plant is working on a lease basis, the effect is greater. But we shall not place restrictions on any parts of a factory or groups of workers who would like to work on lease contract," explains Mr Batalin.

"Of course, we are still relatively inexperienced in this field. We certainly have a theoretical base to start from, but we may have to make changes in our practice."

Lease contracts are just one of the new methods being tried out—so far with some success—to raise profitability, bring certain state enterprises out of the red and increase workers' motivation.

The aim is to encourage workers to feel that they are really owners of their factories and to put an end to the distance some workers have felt lies between them and the managers of their workplaces.

Maritime Kray Leader Views Enterprise Zones

PM3001130589 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 25 Jan 89 Morning Edition p 5

[Interview with V. Lutzenko, chairman of the Maritime Krayispolkom, by correspondent Yu. Balakirev under the "Dialogue" rubric: "The Probable Locations of the Free Enterprise Zones"—date not given; first paragraph is editorial introduction]

[Text] Vladivostok—At the end of 1988 a Japanese businessman and a Moscow scientist, writing in IZVESTIYA (No. 351), set out their ideas on the preconditions for the emergence of new forms of economic development in a number of regions of the eastern USSR. The specific locations of joint enterprise zones were not named and can only be presumed. Nevertheless, the question "How To Begin"—that was the title of the article—is inseparable from the question of where to begin. This was the main theme of a conversation with V. Lutsenko, chairman of the Maritime Krayispolkom.

[Balakirev] Indeed, Valeriy Fedorovich, where does one begin? In which part of the Maritime region could an experiment begin without the need for special preparations?

[Lutsenko] An intelligent choice of options is impossible without the preparation of the necessary bases. The Institute of the World Economy and International Relations is doing that at our request now. The Soviet national committee for Asian and Pacific economic cooperation, headed by Academician Primakov, is working on it. As for the territory, maritime, fishery, and rail workers have presented their reports. It must be noted that the "assimilation" of free economic zones is a new venture for both the kray and the country. There is no experience, and this creates problems.

There is one known quantity, however. The geographical one. There are three locations that are beyond dispute: the Nakhodka and Khasan regions, and the Grodekovo railroad station area. What is a free economic zone? It is a territory with special privileges for production activity by foreign firms and Soviet organizations. It is a kind of window giving easier access for capital, advanced technology, skilled labour, and modern management methods. The southern part of the Maritime region is almost ideal for windows of this kind.

Just look: Grodekovo is a promising transport and transit junction on the Chinese border. The borders of three states meet in Khasanskiy Rayon. It could even be said that there are four borders if you bear in mind that it is only a stone's throw from the port of Posyet to Japan. This zone has good potential for organizing invisible exports, as they are called: tourist services and the use of the territory's recreational facilities, which have long been attractive to foreigners. There are more sites here for the subsequent creation of environmentally clean production units which, although small, are costly in terms of current output. The president of a Japanese insurance company, speaking in a Soviet TV interview recently, talked, as you probably remember, about the possible construction of a specialized auto plant and computer centers. He even said that this could be the site of the best city of the 21st century...

Last, but most important of all, mention should be made of the most northerly region, Nakhodka. The advantages of that site are obvious: three major ports, a railroad, construction capacities, and a developed infrastructure. It also has experience in international contacts.

[Balakirev] In the interview you mentioned it was said that Japanese insurance firms are offering very impressive resources for the creation of a joint land company issuing shares. Other countries will probably also not be slow in coming forward with proposals. How do you see the international range of this partnership?

[Lutsenko] The example of America's West Coast shows that you must involve the potential of the entire Pacific. But I think that it is not only the Asian and Pacific countries that will become involved. The first international meeting in Vladivostok last fall showed the worldwide scale of the interest in the Soviet Far East.

Regardless of the zones, we have business dealings with Yugoslavia, Norway, and Hungary, and France is showing an interest in setting up a computer hardware production unit in the Maritime region. The Italians want to quickly build a hotel complex. Possibilities are opening up for cooperation with South Korea, not to mention direct ties with our nearest neighbors, the PRC and the DPRK. Joint operations based on the sea's resources, especially fish, are feasible now, although there are implications in the use of resources. Foreign firms are not particularly keen on organizing intensive processing. No one wants to give up modern technology, but everyone, aware of our difficulties, tries to take the natural resources and use the Maritime region as a raw materials base. That is the general background. We are studying our partners; they are studying us. For a long time we presumed that foreign economic ties were based on the principle of winners and losers. Now, at a new stage of relations, there must be mutual trust and an excellent grasp of the essential facts.

[Balakirev] You seem to be talking primarily about the competence of the owners of the territory. The anxiety on this count is understandable: it stems from those bitter lessons that occur at every step. They managed to produce a program for the development of the Far Eastern region omitting a package of foreign economic ties. Now people in the capital are adding that package. A Moscow institute is developing the bases of the economic zones for us. Similar work is being done by the institute set up under the State Foreign Economic Commission, whose work on the concept of the zone, it is said, has been included in this year's budget. What is science on the Far East doing here, and how do you view it?

[Lutsenko] Not particularly optimistically. We, of course, turned to the institute dealing with the economic and international problems of assimilating ocean resources and the Economic Studies Institute. They submitted their reports. But even I, a non-specialist in questions of foreign economic activity, especially those connected with joint enterprise zones, think that these reports are of the standard of student essays. Let us hope that the Academy's Far Eastern department will now apply its considerable resources...

[Balakirev] The dissipation of resources always leads to a loss of time and speed. In our case, no one is going to wait or hold back the capital for us. A large number of free enterprise zones are operating in the world already. There are different models and they are well known. Has the discussion of the concept of the zone in general not gone on too long? What is needed now is a concept of the actual plan. And, from the example of the creation of joint enterprises, we know how this is done. You assemble a small group of specialists from various fields and elaborate the basic commercial, technological, market, financial, legal, and other conditions. It does not need an entire academic institute for that, you will agree. Even less, a galaxy of institutes. It needs a team of able specialists on the spot...

[Lutsenko] We are talking about three potential zones in the Maritime region. But even one of them, Nakhodka, needs billions in investments, and the resources of the territory and local science cannot cope. And as for a team of top-quality specialists, a think tank allocated to resolve a concrete task would be a good idea, I agree. But who should set up such a team? I think it should be the USSR Council of Ministers State Foreign Economic Commission, because the decision on the zones is being taken by the government. For our part, we are ready to accept such a group and provide the necessary conditions for it.

But we would go further: Top-quality specialists are needed not just at the planning development stage. It is also necessary to train people for long-term work in joint enterprise zone conditions. That training should begin with us, the leaders. We are still just amateurs in the field of foreign economic contacts. There is chaos in our border trade links, even to the point that state assets of export significance have been squandered. There simply cannot be an amateurish approach to such an important matter as joint enterprise. For us, the problem of the moment is that we must learn and retrain as we go along, without stopping work.

[Balakirev] In a hotel recently some cooperative members in the Far East were pressuring a Japanese businessman, urging him to conclude a deal: We have the right, they said, only one small thing is lacking. But the Japanese said: Listen, what fine music; you have the right to dance this tango, but if you don't know how, you have to learn first...

But in our case, where do we begin? In China, perhaps, where such zones have been in existence for 10 years now? What aspects of our closest neighbor's experience are of most interest to us?

[Lutsenko] All useful experience is of interest to us. China, for instance, managed to attract capital from citizens of Chinese origin—the huaqiao—scattered across the world. Couldn't we take that road? The Russian emigre movement is diverse. Many of those who left our country are now living in Canada, the United States, and other countries. I think that among them there would be people who would like to invest their resources in joint activity. At the moment, however, I do not how to go about this.

In our country today people often will not hear of foreign currency credit. One principle, barter, has been well learned: like for like, goods for goods. But if we want to achieve the particularly high quality of services and infrastructure and attract the technology without which a zone is inconceivable, we must borrow foreign currency on credit. Credits are in fact being offered to us. But we are psychologically unprepared to take advantage of sensible offers.

[Balakirev] Let us return to our original question, Valeriy Fedorovich. How should we begin?

[Lutsenko] All the representatives of foreign business circles whom I have met agree on one thing: You can work miracles on the basis of our natural conditions. Many people are ready to take part in the construction of hotels, camp sites, and tourist complexes. The creation of sports and health complexes and tourist itineraries, and the organization of licensed hunting are feasible and do not require much initial investment. We could begin by calculating the possibility of creating a duty-free transshipment complex based on all or part of the port of Vostochnyy. We also realize that it is important to take the first practical steps.

[Balakirev] I noted that the Maritime Kray's rail and maritime workers and the leadership of Nakhodka Gorispolkom are cautious about the Khasan economic zone option. There is a clear and even marked preference for the Nakhodka region. And the representative of the institute of the economic and international problems of assimilating ocean resouces, a geographer by training, who has been studying the options, has stated that the Posyet-Khasan zone is clearly unprofitable to the Soviet Union and favors not us but China. Is such a comparison appropriate?

[Lutsenko] You can understand the steamship company: Today the seaports are far from overburdened. However, I do not regard the aforementioned free zone options as alternatives. Each option has its merits. The fact that it is possible to develop faster in Nakhodka is a different matter. But that is a question of tactics. From the viewpoint of the strategy of the territory's economic renewal, all the options are attractive. The creation of a triangle based on the greatest areas of growth at Nakhodka, Grodekovo, and Khasan will give an impetus to the whole Maritime region. It is not impossible that, once we have developed a model, we will begin to expand the territories of joint activity.

I would repeat: It is important to make the first move, determine who will implement the plans, and find the necessary initial resources to create the infrastructure, the lack of which is the stumbling block in any discussion on open zones. It is necessary to enshrine in law the preferential terms and the entire mechanism of the special economic zones' operation. Our reasons for haste are not only economic, but political, too. After all, we have told the whole world that we are ready for this cooperation.

Sakhalin's Nogliki Oil, Gas Industry Develops

OW2901031289 Moscow Television Service in Russian 2355 GMT 19 Jan 89

[Report by Kurikalov from Novosti newscast]

[Text] Only several years ago, Nogliki settlement was the shabbiest rayon center of this island oblast. The discovery of rich oil and gas deposits, both on land and on the shelf of the Sea of Okhotsk, gave an impetus to intensive development of the rayon. A school, two stores, and a hotel have been built, and apartment houses are being built one after another in Nogliki settlement. A hospital complex is now under construction. This distant northern settlement has been connected with Yuzhno-Sakhalinsk City, the oblast center, by a railway. [video shows housing construction]

The rapid development demands energetic activity on the part of the rayon party organization. Yuriy Mikhaylovich Kuts, first secretary of the party raykom, is a staunch opponent of the behind-the-desk style of management. Construction and drilling sites, and oil and gas fields are the places he is most likely to be found.

What is causing the greatest concern to the party organization leader of the rayon which, among all Sakhalin oblast's rayons, has the best prospects?

[Begin Kuts recording] Of course, strengthening the material and technical supply base and the social and cultural sphere is the main concern and will continue to be for a long time. We have improved the housing situation a little. In particular, the living space we will commission per capita this year will be more than double that to be commissioned in the oblast as a whole. Next year we hope to increase this to almost three times as much as in the oblast. Nevertheless, we are not satisfied with this rate and must further increase the rate of housing construction. Schools, clinics, children's preschool centers, stores, catering facilities, and sports centers—all these things determine the moods of the people and their social and political feelings. [end recording]

Agricultural

Ligachev Troubleshoots at Dairy Combine 27 Jan

LD2801054789 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1900 GMT 27 Jan 89

[Text] At the end of last year, construction was completed in Moscow and precommissioning adjustments begun on the Lianozovo dairy combine, which is the largest in the country and has an electronic production control system. The combine has a rate capacity of 1,000 tonnes of milk, curd cheese, kefir, ryazhenka, and yogurt per shift. However, development of its production capacities is being impermissably delayed. Meanwhile, there are not always sufficient dairy products in the capital's shops.

On 27 January the new enterprise was visited by Ligachev, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. With the involvement of leaders of the city, ministries, and departments there was an examination of a series of questions connected with accelerating the mastering of its rated capacity. The main question is the formation of party and social organizations of a work collective that are capable of ensuring the stable functioning of this up-to-date food industry enterprise and providing Muscovites with dairy products of excellent quality. The combine's workers and specialists need to create good working and living conditions and the opportunity to raise qualifications. The desire to master waste-free technology and make full use of incoming raw materials was expressed. The USSR State Committee for Standards has been instructed to organize a comprehensive state acceptance service for raw materials and prepared products at Moscow's food industry enterprises. The attention of city organizations was drawn to the need to give constant assistance to the collectives of food industry enterprises, since the degree to which Muscovites are supplied with food products depends to a great extent on their work.

Saykin, chairman of the ispolkom of the Moscow City Soviet, and other leading functionaries took part together with Comrade Ligachev in examining the issues at the Lianozovo dairy combine.

Ligachev Visits Meat Processing Plant 26 Jan

PM2701144589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 27 Jan 89 Second Edition p 2

[TASS report: "More Initiative in Setting Up Food Industry"]

[Text] The USSR Ministry of Construction of Petroleum and Gas Industry Enterprises has formulated a design for a meat processing enterprise with a capacity of 1 tonne of sausages and 2 tonnes of meat per shift. The particular value of this decision is that this is a small-capacity enterprise designed for workers in settlements, rayon centers, agro-industrial associations, combines, and firms. One such complex is capable of supplying meat products for about 20,000 people.

The other value is that these enterprises are modular and prefabricated, that is, they will be built quite quickly, commissioned as turnkey projects, and fitted with Soviet equipment. When these enterprises are set up in the country, distances for delivering livestock for processing will decrease and meat losses will be reduced. All this is exceptionally important for resolving the food question, particularly in small towns and worker settlements.

The USSR Ministry of Construction of Petroleum and Gas Industry Enterprises built the first Soviet complex of this type for producing sausage products at its own production base in the Moscow area. By commissioning it, this ministry, the USSR Gosagroprom, and the Tsentrosoyuz began implementing a major program to set up 1,750 modular meat processing enterprises in various regions of the country in 1989-1995. Ye.K. Ligachev and V.P. Nikonov, and B.Ye. Shcherbina, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, visited the new type of meat processing enterprise 26 January.

V.G. Chirskov, minister of construction of petroleum and gas industry enterprises, reported that the complex was built within 2 months and is intended to finalize the design and organize the construction of fully modular meat-processing enterprises. The ministry is preparing in the near future to assemble such an enterprise as a complete complex with both livestock slaughtering and meat processing. It is this version that people at the local level and in rural rayons are particularly eager to have.

V.M. Lukyanenko, minister of chemical and petroleum machine building, S.P. Chernov, first deputy minister of the defense industry, R.R. Kiryushin, first deputy minister of general machine building, A.P. Bochkov, deputy chairman of the USSR Gossnab, A.P. Lyapchenkov, deputy chairman of the USSR Gosagroprom, and B.I. Gontar, deputy chairman of the Tsentrosoyuz, announced the fulfillment of the government's instruction to organize a broad network of modular meat processing enterprises in the country and organization of production of the necessary technical and power equipment for these purposes.

Summing up the visit to the enterprise, Ye.K. Ligachev and V.P. Nikonov noted the importance of accelerated development in the processing industry. The enterprising work of the Ministry of Construction of Petroleum and Gas Industry Enterprises was approved. The creation of small-capacity enterprises is making fundamental changes to the siting of the food industry, bringing it as close as possible to the places where the agricultural raw materials are produced.

Attention was drawn to ensuring that the technical solutions embodied [in the enterprises] match world standards and guarantee the production of a broad range of high-quality food products. Concern must be shown in advance for training skilled cadres, creating good social conditions for them, and giving them the opportunity to undergo on-the-job training at the best enterprises, including those abroad.

V.S. Chernomyrdin, USSR minister of gas industry, took part in an examination of the question of accelerating fulfillment of the decisions to develop hothouses utilizing heat from gas compressor stations.

Equipment being produced by the USSR Ministry of Construction of Petroleum and Gas Industry Enterprises for the agro-industrial complex was inspected. The various types of power units for personal subsidiary farms, family livestock units, and lease collectives aroused great interest.

The following took part in the examination of the questions: I.I. Skiba and V.I. Shimko, chiefs of CPSU Central Committee departments; V.K. Mesyats, first secretary of the Moscow CPSU Obkom; I.M. Cherepanov, chairman of the oblispolkom; V.M. Serov, deputy chairman of the USSR Gosplan; Ye.I. Sizenko, first deputy chairman of the USSR Gosagroprom; and leaders of RSFSR ministries and departments.

Military

Northern Waters Naval Buildup Denied

PM3001093189 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 28 Jan 89 First Edition p 5

[Article by Major General V. Tatarnikov under the "Military Expert's Opinion" rubric: "Conjecture and Fact"]

[Text] Reports have recently been appearing in the Western press claiming that a substantial strengthening of the Northern Fleet's forces—its modernization and buildup—is under way. West Germany's DIE WELT, in particular, states that Soviet naval forces in that region have received "substantial reinforcement—a heavy cruiser and helicopter carrier" and dozens of improved bombers.

The thesis that the USSR Northern Fleet's commissioning of the aircraft carrier "Baku," the cruiser "Mikhail Kalinin," and new Tu-22M aircraft changes the balance of forces in the Soviet Union's favor is patently far-fetched and does not stand up to criticism. U.S. and NATO superiority in naval armaments, including in the North, is so considerable that the appearance of several units of combat equipment in the USSR has no influence at all on the overall naval balance in northern European waters. The North Atlantic Alliance maintains a considerable superiority there, and this is universally recognized. NATO naval superiority over the Warsaw Pact on a global scale is also a universally recognized fact.

The Northern Fleet's commissioning of new ships and planes must be seen in the context of the replacement of obsolete naval armaments. In recent years the Northern Fleet has decommissioned several tens of combat units, including large submarines and combat planes, particularly Tu-16 bombers.

Articles in the Western press show that a certain confusion and anxiety clearly exist in NATO circles regarding our naval activity. The Soviet Union also has very serious concerns regarding NATO countries' naval activity in the North.

It seems to us that the best way to remove these anxieties is to hold specific talks where an attempt could be made to achieve a common or close understanding of the reasons for each other's actions and the disposition of forces between Warsaw Pact and NATO navies, and to compare the sides' views on the ways and means of enhancing stability here. The Soviet Union has proposed starting consultations between the Warsaw Pact and NATO. A meeting of military experts from both military-political alliances, preferably with the participation of Sweden and Finland, could initially be held by way of preparation for the consultations.

Moreover, the Soviet Union calls on all interested states to begin talks on limiting and reducing the scale of naval activities in the North. Our program to reduce naval activity and provide confidence-building measures in the region, which was formulated by M.S. Gorbachev in Murmansk and given concrete expression by N.I. Ryzhkov in Stockholm and Oslo, has lost none of its relevance, and we will be continuing to seek its implementation. The USSR is also ready to constructively discuss all proposals by other countries both on the nature of the actual problem and in regard to the negotiating forums at which it could be examined.

Yazov Sees No Improvements in Army Training

PM2601092589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 22 Jan 89 Second Edition p 8

[Article by PRAVDA Military Department under the rubric "We Serve the Soviet Union!": "Strict Accountability"]

[Text] Party conferences have ended in military districts, groups of forces, and fleets. Army and Navy Communists discussed urgent problems of the life and combat training of troops and naval forces and the activity of military councils, political organs, and staffs from the standpoint of the demands posed by the 27th CPSU Congress and the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference.

The process of restructuring, expansion of glasnost, and democratization is becoming a deeper part of army life. The activeness and militancy of party organizations in soldiers' collectives are being enhanced. For the first time, the conferences were held as report-back meetings. Delegates appraised the political organs.

It is noteworthy that the criticism of shortcomings and omissions was more constructive and objective. For example, both main report and delegate speeches at the Moscow Military District party conference spoke sharply and in a businesslike fashion about omissions in the work of a number of Communists—chiefs of district directorates and services, deputy commanders, commanders, and chiefs of political organs, staffs, divisions, and military schools. Delegates specifically named the Communists in leadership positions responsible for the omissions and held them strictly accountable.

Communists displayed particular exactingness when analyzing everyone's personal contribution to the strengthening of combat readiness and military discipline. It is no secret that some people are inclined to determine the level of discipline and order by reducing the percentage of so-called nonregulation relations. Percentages can be reduced and, as the experience of past years shows, many have learned to do this. They can be reduced or increased—whatever might be advantageous at the time. But some commanders and political workers unfortunately lack sufficient skill to fully eradicate from servicemen's life the really grating "bullying" and to truly ensure firm regulation order in every subunit.

The imposition of order is still hindered by the great isolation of personnel from combat training. How much time is unjustifiably wasted on whitewashing, painting, and sweeping, especially prior to the arrival of sundry commissions or visits by high-ranking guests. Of course, no one doubts the need for monitoring and assistance from superior staffs. But surely it is possible to streamline the system of checks, inspections, and monitoring? Maybe they should be comprehensive and take place at most once a year?

The totally unabated flow of paperwork is a major hindrance to work. Conference delegate Colonel Mikhaylov calculated that their staff and political section received 3,000 different documents during the year...

Addressing the party conference of the Group of Soviet Forces in Germany, USSR Defense Minister D.T. Yazov noted in particular that the new shoots brought forth by restructuring in the activity of command and political cadres and party organs have not yet produced any noticeable improvement in the overall results in troop training and the strengthening of discipline. In daily life we encounter instances of irresponsibility, complacency, formalism, and bureaucratism which are not given a principled assessment by party organizations.

Restructuring means people, it means their attitude toward work, it means their personal responsibility for the performance of party and service duty. It primarily means a new quality of mutual relations between people. It also means a new quality of work by everyone in his assigned sector.

The new training year is under way in the Army and Navy. It is important to ensure that party conference decisions do not exist only on paper, as it were, and to ensure that Communists and all soldiers get down in a totally organized, disciplined, and responsible fashion to the implementation of these decisions, the unconditional and proper fulfillment of teaching plans and soldiers' training programs. They are obliged to do this both by the demands of the defensive military doctrine and by the forthcoming sizable unilateral reduction in the Soviet Armed Forces.

The forces have now entered a special and complex period when they must truly take a stand in the qualitative restructuring of the army mechanism. After all, even in smaller numbers, Soviet soldiers are called upon to fittingly perform the selfsame tasks—to protect peace and the fatherland's security.

Air Force Training Customs Squander Resources

PM3101103589 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 24 Jan 89 First Edition p 1

[Article by Colonel A. Tsalko, military pilot-expert marksman, under the "Today's Letter" rubric: "We Do Not Value Thrift"]

[Text] In the article entitled "When To Switch on the Afterburner," published in the newspaper 8 January this year, Colonel V. Kopylov examined the potential for fliers to save material resources during combat training. The problem is a topical one and deserves attention, and I would like, therefore, to share my ideas on the question.

The main reason for the irrational use of material resources, in my view, is that most commanders simply have no interest in economizing on what is allocated for combat training. There are many instances, but I propose examining just two of them.

It is well known that millions of rubles are spent in the Defense Ministry on air transport flights. Most transportion is concerned with maintaining the vital activity of troops, and there are no doubts about their expediency. But many flights can only be described as wasteful. There are, for example, a number of different events held each year in which the leading personnel of military districts take part. The leaders arrive in "personal" planes of the Tu-154 and Tu-134 type. Each plane carries only 3-10 passengers.

One hour's flight aboard a Tu-154 costs R2,000, so if its flight is, say, from Khabarovsk to Moscow and back, it costs the state around R30,000. It is many times cheaper to fly 3-10 passengers aboard a Ministry of Civil Aviation aircraft. The savings are obvious, but the relevant officials do not think about it because they do not have to pay for it out of their own pockets.

Helicopters are operated in a roughly similar way in military districts. It has reached an absurd pitch: They are used only because the gasoline quota for official cars has been used up. An Mi-8 helicopter costs R530 per flight-hour, while a 200-km taxi journey comes to R40.

In short, saving resources depends on the decisions taken by officials who wield great power. Why do they exhort their subordinates to save material resources while they themselves waste them on a grand scale. I believe this happens because of the state's complete lack of control over the consumption of resources.

Commanders' lack of interest in saving stems from the impossibility of their using even part of what they save in the interests of the formation, combined unit, or unit. If commanders obtained the right to spend part of the resources saved on constructing accommodation, kindergartens, and other sociocultural facilities and giving the personnel material incentives, they would launch a proper savings campaign and find broad support among subordinates, and as a result the state would retain considerable material resources.

Another reason for lack of interest in making savings on the part of commanders and the personnel as a whole is the absence of economic appraisal of the activity of military bodies on the basis of annual results. Such evaluation is not stipulated by any regulations, and consequently there are no normatives or criteria for the economic efficiency of military training.

Some commanders "coach" their personnel by overspending on material resources, others skillfully combine all forms of instruction; yet, given an equal final result, they will be given an identical evaluation. This leveling-out approach does nothing to make people save.

And another facet of the problem.

At present the Air Force has a surplus of aircrewmen, and with the announced cut of 800 aircraft that surplus will increase. Flight personnel are replenished by military college graduates. In assigning lieutenants to units we follow the path of least resistance, that is to say, we dispose of experienced aircrewmen. How? We declare that they have no prospects at the age of 30 and are "old" at 35. Yet a combat flier is at the peak of his abilities at that age! Fliers are aware of this attitude toward them on the part of Air Force cadre organs, and they themselves try to get out of flying on attaining the requisite length of service in terms of the benefits.

It is worth considering what such a cadre policy costs the state. Tens of thousands of rubles, for example, are spent to train a young flier, a million rubles to train an experienced one. With the departure of the experienced flier, these sums must be invested all over again in a young one. I believe this benefits neither the state nor the Air Force. And therefore, until we begin computing expenditures on combat training and demonstrate it in graphic monetary terms, we will be unable to establish effective work to save state resources.

General Meshcheryakov's Obituary Published

PM2601133189 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 26 Jan 89 First Edition p 3

[Unattributed obituary of Colonel General V.I. Meshcheryakov (retired)]

[Excerpts] Colonel General Valentin Ivanovich Meshcheryakov (retired), a veteran of the Great Patriotic War, has died. He devoted his entire conscious life to the cause of the defense of the socialist Motherland and to selfless service of the Soviet people and the Communist Party, of which he had been a member since 1946. [passage omitted]

After the war V.I. Meshcheryakov held a number of leading posts and was first deputy chief of the Main Administration of the USSR Armed Forces General Staff and chief of a military academy. [passage omitted]

[signed] D.T. Yazov, M.A. Moiseyev, V.G. Kulikov, P.G. Lushev, A.D. Lizichev, Yu.P. Maksimov, Ye.F. Ivanovskiy, I.M. Tretyak, A.N. Yefimov, B.N. Chernavin, M.I. Sorokin, V.M. Arkhipov, V.M. Shabanov, N.V. Chekov, V.L. Govorov, D.S. Sukhorukov, S.F. Akhromeyev, A.I. Sorokin, B.A. Omelichev, V.I. Lobov, V.M. Mikhaylov, P.I. Ivashutin, A.G. Pavlov, Yu.A. Gusev, I.A. Bardeyev, G.A. Mikhaylov, N.G. Gladkikh, L.T. Kuzmin, N.N. Sedov, I.P. Sakulkin, L.K. Bekrenev, Ya.I. Sidorov, V.N. Vashchenko.